

**Merrimack School Board Meeting
Merrimack School District, SAU #26
Merrimack Town Hall – Matthew Thornton Room
September 16, 2019**

PUBLIC MEETING MINUTES

Present: Chair Barnes, Vice Chair Guagliumi, Board Members Nunez, Schneider, and Schoenfeld. Also in attendance were Superintendent McLaughlin, Assistant Superintendent of Curriculum and Instruction Fabrizio, Assistant Superintendent for Business Shevenell, and Student Representative Johanna Koroma.

1. Call to Order/Pledge of Allegiance

Chair Barnes called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

Chair Barnes led the Pledge of Allegiance.

2. Public Participation

There was no public participation.

3. A Sample of On-Going Efforts to Improve and Sustain Student Outcomes

Superintendent McLaughlin stated they had used the School Board meetings as an opportunity to speak with the Board as well as the community regarding the variety of things the District continued to try to do to ensure effective student outcomes which included student learning, understanding, and social and emotional wellness.

4. Universal Design for Learning Program (UDL) in Practice

Superintendent McLaughlin introduced Ms. Nicole Diggins, Language Arts Coordinator, Merrimack Middle School, and Mr. James Costa, Language Arts Teacher, also from the Merrimack Middle School.

Ms. Diggins stated she was present to share her journey as it pertained to the Universal Design for Learning Program (UDL) at the Merrimack Middle School. She said a cohort of seven educators from the middle school was formed and she was asked to facilitate the group. She added the group attended three statewide network meetings, 18 hours were spent after the school day ended to grow their understanding of Universal Design for Learning

Program (UDL) through CAST's (Center for Applied Special Technology) monthly modules as well as the guidance of the District's implementation specialist, Mr. Bill Wilmot.

Ms. Diggins commented after a year of learning the cohort realized that the Universal Design for Learning Program (UDL) was a philosophy and approach to lesson design which was meant not only to help students understand the concept and skills being taught but to help students become expert learners in the classroom as well as life.

Ms. Diggins shared the cohort had been expanded by three members and there was currently representation across both grade levels, on four out of the six teaching teams and from almost all of their content areas. She said a standard feature was implemented as part of their monthly faculty meetings which was called the UDL Spotlight.

Mr. Costa said one of the mantras of the Universal Design for Learning Program (UDL) was "what was necessary for some was good for all" and it allowed students to access the curriculum a little bit better and he noticed the students were excited to be in class because they had a choice in how information was presented to them.

Mr. Costa, referring to a brochure he developed said the first bullet point explained that the program was meant to help students. He further explained the second bullet point talked about how he would not always give the students all available options and the third bullet point went over the fact that some students chose to take the easier way out and perhaps wrote one sentence on a worksheet as opposed to typing out a paragraph and encouraged the students to always challenge themselves and work through barriers.

Mr. Costa said he felt students did great the previous year and felt they were better learners. He also said most of his students were excited to be in his class.

Superintendent McLaughlin commented teachers were learning that sometimes choice itself could be a barrier for the students on occasion and a strategic teacher who knew his/her class knew when a little bit of a choice was appropriate and when too much choice was not.

Board Member Schneider pointed out that the program might create a challenge for students going to college in that everyone had to take tests the same way and did not have a choice or flexibility.

Board Member Nunez asked if the rollout of the Universal Design for Learning Program (UDL) modified the amount of work that a teacher had to do. She asked Mr. Costa how it had changed him as a teacher. Mr. Costa replied there were a few extra things he had to do but for the most part it was not a lot more work.

5. High School Graduation Rates

Chair Barnes invited Ms. Sharon Putney, Principal; Mr. Richard Zampieri, Assistant Principal and, Mr. Peter Bergeron, Assistant Principal, all from Merrimack High School.

Ms. Putney addressed the Board and stated the information which she would present was divided into three sections:

- Data (most of which were provided from the DOE – (New Hampshire Department of Education)
- Retention Efforts
- Future Aspirations

Data

Ms. Putney said according to the Department of Education's (DOE's) website students in New Hampshire were entered into a cohort beginning in grade 9 and the graduation rate was calculated by the number of graduates divided by the original cohort number from grade 9.

Ms. Putney stated in 2014-2015, the number of cohorts was 337 and the number of graduates was 303 or 89.91%. She further stated in 2015-2016, the number of cohorts was 300 and the number of graduates was 291 or 88.18%; in 2016-2017, the number of cohorts was 289 and the number of graduates was 251 or 86.85% and in 2017-2018, the number of cohorts was 323 and the number of graduates was 278 or 86.07%. She pointed out the data was not yet available for 2018-2019.

Ms. Putney said the graduation rate only took into account those students who graduated within the four-year timeframe with what was considered a "regular" high school diploma. She further said a student who graduated in more than four years by the Department of Education guidelines was considered a non-graduate and could not be counted as a graduate for the Merrimack High School. Ms. Putney explained students who had medical issues, family issues, special needs or trauma but graduated later than the scheduled time, with a modified diploma or certificate of completion were not considered graduates.

Ms. Putney commented there were factors which were out of the control of students in some situations. She said in order to have a graduation rate of 100% it would mean that every student who started in grade 9 graduated four years later with a regular high school diploma.

Ms. Putney referred to a chart which reflected the drop-out rates according to the Department of Education (DOE) for Merrimack High School from 2015-2018. She said the chart included

the number of students who earned their Hi-Set or GED (General Equivalency Diploma) the number who dropped out and the percentage of students included in the drop-out rate only. She further said the drop-out rate percentages were quite low noting in 2014-2015, the drop-out rate was only 1.78%; in 2015-2016, it was 2.42% in 2016-2017, it was 1.38% and in 2017-2018 it was 2.17%. Ms. Putney stated the goal was always to have a graduation rate of 100%.

Retention Efforts

Ms. Putney said there were transitional efforts in place to help students from the middle school who were advancing to high school. She reviewed those efforts as summarized below:

- 8.5 Program
- Tours for Identified Students
- Parent and Student Information Nights
- Placement Improvements
- Extended School Year (ESY)
- Freshmen Adventure and Freshmen Series (Guidance)
- Challenge Day for Grade 9
- Skills Centers for all Grades with Particular Focus on Grade 9/Learning Support
- Homeroom/Advisory: Same Teacher all Four Years
- Success in School Program (Grade 9)

Ms. Putney noted there were also retention efforts currently in place throughout a students' high school career which included the following:

- Special Programs to meet our Student's needs
- Guidance Services and Series for each Grade Level
- Student Support Team meets Weekly to Wrap around at-risk and Struggling Students
- Credit Recovery/Evening Academy and Summer Academy (She noted waivers were given to students who needed financial assistance.)
- Clubs/Activities/Athletics
- Homeroom Advisory
- Mental Health Team
- Individual Meetings with at-risk Students
- Skills Centers

Ms. Putney continued by reviewing the retention efforts which were currently in place as students transitioned from Merrimack High School to post Merrimack High School.

- Senior Series (Seniors received visits and advice from Guidance)
- Plan Generated by each Student in Post-Secondary Class
- Transition Personnel to Assist Students
- Vocational Programs
- Online Courses
- Authentic Vocational Experiences at Merrimack High School Get Set with Supplies (Students received real-life customer service skills among others.)
- College Credit: Running Start/AP (Advanced Placement)/Transfer Credits from another Institution

Future Aspirations

Ms. Putney said future aspirations included:

- Alternative Pathways to Earning a High School Diploma
- Future's Lab (A place where students could get support/smaller learning environment to complete online courses and attend some high school classes)

Board Member Nunez stated students who graduated in more than four years were considered a non-graduate and asked how many students fell into that category. Mr. Zampieri replied it was not that those students were not considered graduates but they were not counted towards the graduation rate. Ms. Putney added that the high school did not track the information by cohort in the same way the Department of Education (DOE) did.

Board Member Nunez asked what some of the barriers some students might have that would cause them to drop-out and how could the District support them better. Ms. Putney replied the previous year a couple of students had come into the District at the beginning of their senior year and did not attend any classes which were reflected in the books as a drop-out. Ms. Putney explained the cohort number would be adjusted if a student transferred out of the high school into another school and it would not be considered as a drop-out. Ms. Putney further explained that there were students who dropped out but came back to school and they were still counted as a drop-out. She said it was a confusing process.

Superintendent McLaughlin added that the graduation rate and drop-out rate was not the same thing. He said in the case of a student who entered a cohort and then because of illness or injury, etc. took longer to graduate, the District would not be "credited" with that student in the calculation of the graduation rate. He said if a student had an unforeseen

illness or injury and because of that illness or injury may need five years to graduate. He said, however, because they were not able to graduate within the four-year timeframe, it looked as if the graduation rate was not as good as it actually was.

Board Member Schoenfeld commented she felt the most interesting area was the difference between the graduation rate versus the drop-out rate. She said she wondered how much of it was intentional.

Vice Chair Guagliumi commented she would like to know more about how the Merrimack School District compared with similar districts. She asked how the District defined students who were “at-risk.” Ms. Putney replied there was not a general definition that would apply to all situations but there were some students who were failing multiple classes and some students who had experienced trauma among other things.

Superintendent McLaughlin added there were times when a person appeared healthy and there could be things happening in the body which were unbeknownst to anybody and are diagnosed with a serious illness. He said one of the things they looked at were students who had done quite well in previous years but then suffer a sudden slip. He further said there were some cases where students had a sudden onset of an emotional challenge and there were no signs for remediation. Superintendent McLaughlin stated the definition of “at-risk” was very flexible and required careful attention as to how a student presented himself/herself.

Vice Chair Guagliumi asked what advice should be given to parents of students who were at-risk or needed extra supports in place to ensure that he/she would graduate within four years. Ms. Putney replied parents should reach out to herself, guidance counselors or assistant principals and noted earlier was better if a parent felt a student was at-risk.

Student Representative Koroma commented in her experience she had seen several of her classmates drop out of school due to emotional problems. She further said she would like to see a mental health initiative in the school. Chair Barnes replied one of the ways the District was addressing that was grades one through eight were being taught with a Social and Emotional Learning curriculum. She also said the conversation would be continued.

Chair Barnes announced the agenda would be heard out of order with item #7 being next.

7. Emergency Rule Concerning Medicaid Reimbursement

Chair Barnes introduced Ms. Heather Barker, who was the new Director of Student Services. Ms. Barker explained Medicaid to Schools was routed in the reauthorization of the Education for All Handicapped Children Act from 1975 which was reauthorized as IDEA (Individuals

with Disabilities Education Act) of 1990. She said it was in place to ensure that students with disabilities had access to medical and related services necessary for them to be able to be educated in the public school system. (Services included occupational therapy, speech, and language services, and orientational ability, just to name a few) She further said after the reauthorization in 1990, Medicaid allowed schools to be reimbursed for a portion of the services.

Ms. Barker stated the school received a portion of the cost for the required related services because it was a requirement of the students IEP (Individualized Education Program) and therefore, the District had to provide the services. She further stated that historically, the reimbursements had allowed schools to offset the cost of the related services without having to use only regular education dollars.

Ms. Barker explained that on August 27, 2019, the Department of Health and Human Services issued an emergency rule which was meant to address people's lack of understanding as to how to address the expanded coverage and the rule would remain in effect until February 24, 2020. She further explained that Medicaid expanded coverage two years prior allowing students beyond those students with IEP's to access care plans where students needed billable services such as counseling and mental health services. She said New Hampshire SB-235 established that schools could receive the reimbursement for services for the highly at-risk youth and their families whether there was an IEP in place or not. Further, Ms. Barker said the intention of the rule, as stated by the Department of Health and Human Services was "to assist schools in avoiding fiscal harm by allowing them to seek reimbursement for the identified expanded services and the expanded population."

Ms. Barker commented the rule became a concern because they had actually created fiscal harm which did not exist prior to the emergency rule by instituting major policy change without providing an opportunity through notice and comment period for schools, which was the typical process when a rule went through. She said historically Medicaid to Schools (MTS) had allowed for a physician or a licensed practitioner of the Healing Arts who practiced within the scope of their practice to order, recommend or refer services when ordered by the IEP team. She said what happened under the new emergency rule was that Medicaid to Schools (MTS) was restricted to a physician and/or licensed practitioner, noting in the past, the licensed practitioners were Licensed Practitioners of the Healing Arts and were limited to a physician's assistant (PA) or an Advanced Practical Registered Nurse (APRN.) She further noted the PA and the APRN could only act under the order of a physician.

Ms. Barker said the Department of Health and Human Services no longer accepted school-based licensed practitioners such as school psychologists, guidance counselors, nurses and others who had historically ordered the services which were reimbursable.

Ms. Barker stated although the intent to ease had not been achieved due to the restriction of the order for Medicaid reimbursement having to be by a physician or overseen by a physician. She further stated the deletion of the licensed practitioner of the Healing Arts within the scope of his/her practice under state law, without any rationale or notice to school districts had an adverse effect in that the school could not bill for reimbursable services effective August 27th because MD's and ARPN's were not part of IEP teams.

Assistant Superintendent for Business Shevenell said the District received approximately \$800,000 in Medicaid to Schools Funding and throughout the years with various rules and regulation changes, the District was down to approximately \$500,000 which created a large financial impact. He said they billed for \$2.3 million in the past year and from that, they received \$500,000. He further said while the rule was put in place to assist districts, it did not because the number of providers who could make referrals were limited.

Assistant Superintendent of Curriculum and Instruction Fabrizio said a big concern of his was the fact that the new rule limited a physician or a medical professional to make determinations in an IEP (Individualized Education Program) and it questioned the team approach and the input of all members of a team when deciding what services a child needed.

Board Member Schoenfeld clarified that in a situation where an IEP (Individualized Education Program) meeting took place which included a qualified speech therapist in addition to other team members and it was determined a child could benefit from speech therapy that currently the team could no longer make that decision as it pertained to reimbursement. She further asked if she were correct that the team would currently have to seek out a physician to confirm the determination prior to the school receiving reimbursement. Ms. Barker replied that was correct.

Board Member Schoenfeld stated another concern she wanted to add to the list was the fact that a medical doctor was not a speech therapist and therefore, was outside the realm of his/her training.

Chair Barnes pointed out the District was still required by federal law to deliver the services noted in the IEP. She said the only difference was that the District was no longer eligible by law to be reimbursed for the services. Ms. Barker replied that was correct.

Chair Barnes said the delivery of the services would still take place but there was no money for it so the local tax rate would be impacted and there was nothing they could do about it from a legal standpoint. Vice Chair Guagliumi stated she agreed with Chair Barnes and it was creating a problem for a budget which was already set.

Chair Barnes invited the State Representatives who were present to speak.

Representative Wendy Thomas addressed the Board and asked if the rule came from the Department of Education (DOE) or the Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS). Ms. Barker replied it came from the Department of Health and Human Services.

Representative Thomas asked if a child who needed an IEP went to their own physician and that physician agreed with the IEP if they would then get reimbursed for it. Ms. Barker replied she did not know the answer to the question and there were no guidelines surrounding that piece of it.

Representative Dick Barry addressed the Board and said he contacted Mr. Jeff Myers, Commissioner, Department of Health and Human Services, and received a reply as summarized below:

The issue being raised with you involves the Medicaid to School Program under which federal matching funds are obtained to help pay for services provided for Medicaid to Schools eligible children. We recently discovered that school districts across the state were billing for Medicaid services provided under IEP's provided by school employees, like guidance counselors, who were not credentialed nor qualified under federal law to provide those services. Many of the services the schools provide to this program must be provided under the direction of a credentialed healthcare provider. If we do not correct this immediately, the state will be subject to very significant liability and millions of dollars would be at risk of being paid back to the federal government. Both the Department of Education and my department met about one week ago with school Superintendent's to explain the issue and there has and will continue to be outreach on the issue.

Representative Barry stated as he read it people could still do the IEP's as they had been doing them all along but once the needs were going to be met they had to be met by somebody who was credentialed. He further stated if it were true that services were being provided by people who were not credentialed then the federal government could come back at them.

Superintendent McLaughlin clarified that was not the same situation which was happening in Merrimack.

Ms. Barker commented that she attended a meeting with the New Hampshire Association of Special Education Administrators and in all of the follow-up documentation which included attorneys, Representative Barry's point had not been raised and the language she used was verbatim from the law.

Representative Thomas asked what they could do to help the situation. Superintendent McLaughlin replied the most immediate thing to do was to ask for a suspension of the emergency rule.

Representative Rosemarie Rung addressed the Board and said Part §II (B) stated: “the provider is a Medicare participating provider and meets all federal and state provider qualification requirement.” She further stated that sentence may have been overinterpreted by the department in the rulemaking as far as the person initiating the medical order.

Vice Chair Guagliumi moved (seconded by Board Member Nunez) to request that Chair Barnes, on behalf of the Merrimack School Board, submit a letter to the appropriate authorities requesting an immediate suspension of the recently declared emergency rule pertaining the Medicaid to Schools Program at its meeting on September 20th, 2019.

Discussion:

Board Member Schoenfeld said she supported the motion but asked if the School Board stepping in by sending a letter would result in unforeseen complications. Superintendent McLaughlin replied he spoke with the School Board’s Association and there was clarification if the School Board chose to make such a motion that it would be within its purview to do.

Representative Shannon Chandley addressed the Board and said she felt the recipients of the letter should be Commissioner Edelblut and Commissioner Myers but also felt it was perfectly fine to copy the Chair of the Joint Legislative Committee on Administrative Rules (JLCAR).

The motion passed 5-0-0.

6. Role of Homework in the Merrimack School District

Superintendent McLaughlin commented the issue of homework had surprisingly taken center stage for some time in Merrimack. He also commented because there was litigation surrounding the issue for an extended period of time speaking publicly about it was ill-advised.

Superintendent McLaughlin said the situation had been resolved in the court system. He also said one of the things that may have been lost in the discussion over a period of years was what the actual policy meant.

Superintendent McLaughlin read aloud from the Homework Policy which was currently in place as summarized below:

Homework is a constructive tool in the teaching/learning process when geared to the needs and abilities of students. Purposeful assignments not only enhance student achievement but also develop self-discipline and associated good working habits. As an extension of the classroom, homework must be planned and organized, must be viewed as purposeful to the students; and should be evaluated and returned to students in a timely manner.

Teachers may give homework to students to aid in the student's educational development. Homework should be an application or adaptation of a classroom experience, and should not be assigned for disciplinary purposes.

A teacher shall carefully explain to his/her students how homework assignments relate to the grading system.

Legal Reference: NH Code of Administrative Rules, Section Ed. 306.14(b), Basic Instructional Standards

1st Reading: May 12, 2008

2nd Review: May 19, 2008

Adoption: June 2, 2008

Superintendent McLaughlin said when the homework issue first arose it did so because they attempted to clarify the protocol of interpreting the policy and for some, it became conflated with having amended the policy without the School Board's approval. He further said that was not the case and the policy had not changed since its adoption on June 2, 2008.

Superintendent McLaughlin stated the policy did not require homework to be assigned and the policy did not say that it should. He further stated that the policy did not require homework to be graded. Superintendent McLaughlin explained, however, how the grading of homework was handled had to be clearly articulated to the students. He also explained that nowhere in the policy did it say homework was not important and the District recognized the importance of homework and always had.

Superintendent McLaughlin pointed out the issue had to do with its appropriateness to be graded. He said research supported both sides of the argument but practice and logic showed incentives such as a giving a student an A if they completed their homework did not support the notion of self-discipline and associated good working habits.

Superintendent McLaughlin said in the Merrimack School District when a teacher assigned homework it was their duty to evaluate the homework and return it to their students. He acknowledged there was sometimes a lag time between the time the homework assignment was issued and the time it was returned as well as not being properly evaluated.

Superintendent McLaughlin reviewed the reasons homework might not be graded. He said homework was about practice just like sports, music and art and similar to anything else one wanted to get better at practice was needed. He said the teams of teacher's kindergarten through grade 12, as well as administrators who worked on the issue, concluded that since students practiced to get better, the practice itself should not count toward a grade. He further said it was pretty clear that not practicing or not doing homework could have a significant impact on the variety of assessments that did count.

Superintendent McLaughlin stated the intent of the no grading protocol was never about raising or lowering a students' GPA (Grade Point Average.) He further stated that not grading homework was about equity, responsibility, and transparency.

Superintendent McLaughlin noted the District would continue to monitor implementation of fidelity. He further noted classwork as homework was an example of a work-around and they were working very hard with teachers regarding what was appropriate and inappropriate. He also said there was a distinction between doing projects at home and homework which was practiced at home. Additionally, Superintendent McLaughlin said there needed to be a timely return of all homework assignments pointing out the teachers were getting better at doing that.

Superintendent McLaughlin shared many things were learned through the long process and one of those things was they needed to do a better job explaining the process to all of the stakeholders and clearly that had not been done in the past.

Superintendent McLaughlin explained the Merrimack School District was working under the College and Career Ready Standards which stated they had to be able to put forth students who were ready to go to college or to work.

Board Member Schneider requested that the administration provide the School Board with an update regarding the homework policy as part of the quarterly curriculum.

Board Member Nunez stated she was in full support of the homework policy and the challenge it presented was more of a communication breakdown. She further stated they needed to do a better job at ensuring that parents, teachers, and students were all on the same page.

Vice Chair Guagliumi stated she fully supported that the grades best reflect the knowledge but agreed communication remained very important. She also stated that all teachers should put feedback regarding homework assignments into PowerSchool so parents and students could access the information.

8. Consideration of Restructured Human Resource Office

Superintendent McLaughlin mentioned the Director of Human Resources had retired and suggested that the department might benefit from restructuring. He noted the School Board had two proposed job descriptions for a Human Resources Systems Manager and a Human Resources Coordinator. Further, he pointed out the District would be able to fill both positions within the current budgeted amount for the Human Resources Director and the Human Resources Assistant.

Board Member Schoenfeld asked if they would lose any higher-level expertise that a director would tend to bring to the role. Superintendent McLaughlin replied they had contemplated that but the District currently had a lot of talented people and he was not particularly concerned about it.

Vice Chair Guagliumi shared she was concerned that some of the responsibilities might have to be absorbed by the administration. Assistant Superintendent for Business Shevenell replied he was very interested in contributing to the automation of the department.

Assistant Superintendent for Business Shevenell pointed out the job descriptions were in draft form and they would be refined as they had further discussions.

Board Member Nunez suggested they might change the title of Human Resources Coordinator to Assistant Manager to even out the roles.

Board Member Schneider suggested they might change the title of Human Resources Systems Manager to Human Resources Manager which took the word "Systems" out. He said he thought that implied more of a technology role.

Chair Barnes stated the item would be put on the next meetings' Consent Agenda.

9. Approval of Minutes

August 26, 2019 – Public Meeting Minutes

Vice Chair Guagliumi moved (seconded by Board Member Schoenfeld) to approve the minutes from the August 26, 2019, meeting.

Chair Barnes asked if there were members of the Board who had edits.

Page 5, line #183 – “Vice Chair Guagliumi pointed out that the School Board had never received any notifications” was changed to “Vice Chair Guagliumi pointed out to her knowledge that the School Board had never received any notifications.” – Guagliumi

Page 6 – “Mr. Finlay Rothhaus was a member of Town Council” was added – Guagliumi

Page 6, line #202 – “in my opinion” was changed to “in his opinion” – Guagliumi

The motion passed 5-0-0.

September 3, 2019, Public Meeting Minutes

Vice Chair Guagliumi moved (seconded by Board Member Schneider) to approve the minutes from the September 3, 2019, meeting.

Chair Barnes asked if there were members of the Board who had edits.

Page 4, line #150 – “and she asked if this part was completed as well” was added after the word entranceway - Guagliumi

Page 9, line #348 – “Vice Chair Guagliumi commented she had heard a lot of” was changed to Vice Chair Guagliumi commented we had heard a lot of” – Guagliumi

Page 9 – “Assistant Superintendent McLaughlin agreed to review it” was added - Guagliumi

The motion passed 5-0-0.

10. Acceptance of Gifts/Grants under \$5,000

- American Tower Corporation/Saint-Gobain Corporation, Inc. to Merrimack High School for \$2,924.28

Assistant Superintendent for Business Shevenell stated the above gift was being donated to support the Merrimack High School First Team Chop Shop #166.

Board Member Schneider moved (seconded by Board Member Nunez) to accept the gift with the School Board’s sincere appreciation.

The motion passed 5-0-0.

11. Correspondence

a) Correspondence

Chair Barnes stated the previous Friday afternoon after the agenda was posted and the packets were sent out, Town Council sent the School Board a Memo of Agreement and the content was inconsistent with the motion passed at the Special School Board Meeting held on August 26th. She further stated the stipulations the School Board agreed upon at the meeting was the immediate ownership of the existing sewer line to be done by the Town, a Certificate of Permanent Occupancy for the Merrimack Middle School, and the Board wanted to be involved in the construction schedule where it impacted District operations. Further, Chair Barnes explained the offer from the Town included the ownership of the sewer line would only happen after the project was done, the Certificate of Permanent Occupancy would also only be offered after the construction was complete, and there was no mention at all about the District operations and the impact construction would have it. Chair Barnes noted the item would be tabled until the next meeting, date specific to October 7th and recommended the Board not hold a special meeting in the interim as that had not done them any good.

Vice Chair Guagliumi stated a parent reached out to her regarding the parking situation at the high school. She said she shared the parent's concern with Ms. Putney, Principal, Merrimack High School, Superintendent McLaughlin, Assistant Superintendent of Curriculum and Instruction Fabrizio as well as Chair Barnes.

b) Comments

There were no comments.

12. New Business

There was no new business.

13. Committee Reports

Board Member Schneider commented earlier that evening there was a SERESC (Southeastern Regional Education Service Center) Board of Director's meeting but noted he was unable to attend because he was taking part in an interview for the Program Director position.

Chair Barnes shared that she attended the Greater Woods Subcommittee meeting and they updated the Stewardship Plan

14. Public Comments on Agenda Items

Representative Rung commented in the past the drop-out rate correlated with the economy in that some students would drop-out because they wanted to work.

Representative Rung also suggested in the future Ms. Putney may want to get the number of students who graduated with a modified diploma as well as those who obtained a GED (General Equivalency Diploma.)

15. Manifest

The Board signed the manifest.

At 10:55 p.m. Board Member Schneider moved (seconded by Board Member Nunez) to adjourn the public meeting.

The motion passed 5-0-0.