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Board of Education, Concord School District
Annual Organization meeting and Regular meeting
January 6, 2020

Board members present: Gina Cannon; Tom Croteau, Chuck Crush, Barb Higgins, Jennifer Patterson, Liza Poinier, Danielle Smith, Jim Richards, David Parker, student representatives Gaven Brown and Alice Richards

Administrators: Interim Superintendent Frank Bass, Donna Palley, Business Administrator Jack Dunn, Director of Facilities Matt Cashman

Annual Organizational Meeting

Superintendent Frank Bass called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. and recognized new Board members David Parker and Gina Cannon. He pointed out those clauses in the Charter that govern the first meeting of the Board in each calendar year. Superintendent Bass then opened the floor to nominations for President of the School Board.

Tom Croteau nominated Jennifer Patterson for President, noting that she has every qualification necessary to lead. Danielle Smith seconded the motion. Chuck Crush nominated Barb Higgins for President. Gina Cannon seconded the motion. There were no other nominations.

The Board voted 4-3 by roll call (Danielle Smith, Jim Richards, Tom Croteau, Liza Poinier voted yes. David Parker, Chuck Crush, Gina Cannon voted no. Barb Higgins, Jennifer Patterson abstained.) to elect Jennifer Patterson as President of the Concord School Board for 2020 (motioned by Mr. Croteau, seconded by Danielle Smith).

The Board voted 3-4 by roll call (David Parker, Chuck Crush, Gina Cannon voted yes. Jim Richards, Tom Croteau, Danielle Smith, Liza Poinier voted no. Barb Higgins, Jennifer Patterson abstained.) to elect Barb Higgins as President of the Concord School Board for 2020 (motioned by Mr. Crush, seconded by Ms. Cannon).

As the votes were mis-reported originally, the Board voted a second time on the nomination of Jennifer Patterson as President of the Board.

The Board voted 4–2 by roll call (Danielle Smith, Jim Richards, Tom Croteau, Liza Poinier voted yes. Chuck Crush, Gina Cannon voted no. Barb Higgins, Jennifer Patterson, David Parker abstained.) to elect Jennifer Patterson as President of the Concord School Board for 2020 (motioned by Mr. Croteau, seconded by Ms. Smith).

Newly elected Board President Patterson suggested that the Board further discuss the process at the Board’s January retreat.
Ms. Patterson asked for nominations for Vice President of the Board.

Mr. Crush nominated Jim Richards as Vice President, noting that he had done an excellent job as a senior member of the Board. Mr. Croteau seconded the motion.

The Board voted 8–0 by roll call (Jim Richards abstained) to elect Jim Richards as Vice President of the Board for 2020 (motioned by Mr. Crush, seconded by Mr. Croteau).

Ms. Patterson nominated Barb Higgins as Secretary of the Board. Mr. Crush seconded the motion. Tom Croteau nominated Liza Poinier as Secretary of the Board. Mr. Richards seconded the nomination. There were no other nominations.

The Board voted 6–1 by roll call (David Parker, Danielle Smith, Barb Higgins, Jennifer Patterson, Chuck Crush, Gina Cannon voted yes. Tom Croteau voted no. Jim Richards and Liza Poinier abstained.) to elect Barb Higgins as secretary of the Board for 2020 (motioned by Ms. Patterson, seconded by Mr. Crush).

Ms. Patterson nominated Patrick Taylor as Deputy Clerk of the Board. Ms. Higgins seconded the motion. There were no other nominations.

The Board voted 9–0 to appoint Patrick Taylor as Deputy Clerk of the Board for 2020, with thanks (motioned by Ms. Patterson, seconded by Ms. Higgins).

The Board voted 9–0 to adjourn the organizational meeting (motioned by Ms. Higgins, seconded by Ms. Cannon).

The organizational meeting adjourned at 7:13 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Barb Higgins, Secretary
Board members: Jennifer Patterson, President; Gina Cannon, Tom Croteau, Chuck Crush, Barb Higgins, Liza Poinier, Jim Richards, Danielle Smith, David Parker; student representatives Gaven Brown and Alice Richards

Administrators: Superintendent Frank Bass, Donna Palley, Business Administrator Jack Dunn, Director of Facilities Matt Cashman

Agenda Item 1. Call to Order

Board President Jennifer Patterson called the meeting to order at 7:13 p.m. and welcomed new Board members David Parker and Gina Cannon.

Agenda Item 2. Approval of Agenda

The Board voted 9-0 to approve the agenda (motioned by Tom Croteau, seconded by Chuck Crush).

Agenda Item 3. Safety, security and well-being update

Dr. Bass asked CEA President and BGS teacher Michael Macri to present concerns about out-of-control, unsafe behaviors on the part of a number of students, which disrupt the learning environment for other students. Mr. Macri described these conditions in some detail and noted that 15 years ago, the Board decided to adopt a total inclusion model which, teachers feel, works for some students but not for all. He stated that many young teachers are thinking of leaving the profession due to injuries, sometimes in isolated situations. He said he did not mean to imply that every class was out of control, and said the population of concern was only 1%-2% of students across the District. He said over 300 professional staff members had signed the letter of concern. Dr. Bass noted that this area would be analyzed on a holistic basis, and provided several examples.

Dr. Bass noted that one of the issues impacting student safety was communication, including administrator visibility; the ability to respond and follow through in a timely manner; clearer lines of authority and accountability. He stated that CHS interim Principal Michael Reardon planned to recalibrate the CHS administration to have more direct contact with staff and students. He discussed the Director of Guidance and additional Guidance counselor positions that might be proposed in the upcoming budget.
CHS interim Principal Michael Reardon briefly described the lockdown at CHS earlier that day, including the interaction with the student involved. Much of the school was unaware there was a lockdown. Dr. Reardon apologized that there was no announcement made over the public address system. He put out a School Messenger announcement after school, the faculty met to discuss the incident, and the administrative team met for several hours after school to discuss the parameters of the event. He said software in the building doors that would allow the building to be locked down during the day in the case of an external threat was being explored. He suggested installing internal gates in two to three locations in the building (especially for after school evening/weekend events), and hiring someone (perhaps a former police officer) as a para-security person from noon to 6 pm, someone who was good with kids, had a good sense of how the school works and could be a “rover.” In the late afternoon, there was inadequate supervision in the building. He also would like to control elevator access after school. Dr. Reardon addressed the CHS master schedule, noting that too many students have unscheduled time, are in study halls or are wandering around. The intent would be to analyze the structure of the school day and institute a new schedule the year after next. He said he was interested in establishing daily advisories (comprised of the same group of students over four years), to help every student have a close connection with an adult and feel more part of the school as a whole.

David Parker said he would need to think about supervisory models. Many people know how to deal with safety protocols. He said it was important to clearly identify the problem. He said that advisories could deteriorate after two years.

Mr. Richards suggested that Dr. Reardon include the necessary officials to make sure that accessibility throughout the building was guaranteed.

Ms. Patterson noted that there were likely budget implications from this discussion, as well as ADA and code issues.

Dr. Bass noted that he was examining the possibility of an SRO position at RMS, $25,000 of which (out of $100,000) would be funded by the Concord Police Department. He noted that, while some community members wanted more information about the Memo of Understanding between the District and the CPD, the Police Chief wanted to keep the language the same. Chief Osborn has met with District administrators to talk about what constitutes a call to police (whether a red mark on the skin would indicate bodily assault, for example). Dr. Bass planned to meet with the elementary Principals to discuss some of the issues Mike Macri raised. He said that, while there might at a given time be three students creating disturbances in the classrooms, these might not always be the same students. He said the teams would analyze individual situations and current programs. He acknowledged that more commonality between teacher, student and parent was needed, so that modeled behaviors in school could be replicated in the home.

Mr. Crush commented that it was positive that Ms. Patterson and Dr. Bass had met and discussed Mr. Macri’s concerns, which Board members had just received in the form of a letter, and asked about the next steps related to this letter. Dr. Bass noted that he and Mr.
Macri have regular conversations and agreed to weigh the safety and security of individual with class safety and learning environment.

Mr. Croteau said he supported an SRO at RMS and regular meetings with CPD Chief Osgood and the building Principals.

Dr. Bass introduced the draft School Safety Compliance Officer job description, which Donna Palley briefly reviewed. Ms. Patterson said she was interested in whether the position was being brought forward to be filled immediately. Business Administrator Jack Dunn said there might be savings in the copier contract, which was up for renewal. In response to a question from Mr. Crush, Dr. Bass said the person in the proposed position would report to the Superintendent directly. He noted that Title IX/compliance officer positions differed across the State, but that adding a JD requirement would be valuable. Ms. Patterson said she thought this position was important and should be filled immediately.

Ms. Higgins made a motion to move forward with the position at that time. Ms. Patterson seconded the motion.

Mr. Croteau asked about the dollar figure being considered, as savings in the copier contract would be a one-time deal. Mr. Dunn noted that the potential annual salary of $80,000-90,000, with benefits, would likely total $130,000. In response to a question from Mr. Parker whether this would be an administrative position, Ms. Patterson suggested it was important that one centralized person heard all the complaints throughout the District, and should be in an office removed from building operations, but able to be accessed by anyone. Mr. Crush asked whether there was a State standard for the Title IX Coordinator position. Dr. Bass said he would check with DOE.

Mr. Parker suggested that many districts were facing Title IX issue and addressing it variably. Mr. Richards suggested the need to review the job description and answer some of the questions that had been raised. Ms. Higgins agreed to amend her motion.

The Board voted 9-0 to create an ad hoc committee comprised of Board members Barb Higgins, Jennifer Patterson and Gina Cannon to work with Dr. Bass, Mr. Dunn and Ms. Palley to obtain answers to the questions that were discussed here in order to move forward with the hiring of a SSCO officer (moved by Barb Higgins, seconded by Ms. Patterson).

Ms. Palley described a considerable number of initiatives that were in place in the District, had been established over 6-8 months with a variety of partnerships statewide, or were in the planning stages.

- Student Safety and Well-Being strategic planning task force
- Safety training for all new staff offered on a monthly basis
- Ongoing work with Project Grow
- Gathering student and staff input on proposed policies with student Board representatives
• ACERT, of which Concord is a founding member: a group for children who have been exposed to violence in the community
• 40-member social-emotional learning task force has utilized an outside facilitator and is focusing on best practices, with the goal of developing a white paper. The group was mapping interventions in programs currently in place and looking for any gaps. This data-driven, targeted group was studying the best research-based interventions to be offered and would endorse specific competencies.

Mr. Crush asked whether, in light of the increased education and many good partnerships the District has established, its response would be different this year from last year regarding the alleged assaults. Ms. Palley commented that, with some changes in policies and procedures, the strengthening of partnerships and ongoing conversations would mean that everyone had heightened awareness of the resources available in the community. Mr. Crush asked how the partnerships would help students, teachers and the community; how they would impact things differently. Mr. Parker asked how this would apply to behaviors in the classroom. Ms. Patterson noted again that changing a culture was a long process and was going to take a long time; perhaps longer than September 2020. Liza Poinier asked about the new tip reporting system. Dr. Bass, in conclusion, said he was continually working on a sense of collegiality and communication.

Agenda Item 4. Public Comment- agenda items only
Concord student Connor Fennessy commented that CMS should have a longer lunch time, as kids need to have enough time to eat and digest their food. He suggested increasing lunch time from 20 minutes to 30 minutes, and having two grades eat lunch together. (K and 1; 2 and 3; 4 and 5). Danielle Smith commented that her children at BMS feel they also do not have enough time for lunch.

Dr. Bass commented that the lowest legal limit for lunchtime is 20 minutes. He would report to the Board with some thoughts on this.

Agenda Item 5. Approval of Board Minutes
Ms. Patterson reviewed the minutes of the regular Board meeting on December 9, 2019.

The Board voted 9–0 to approve the minutes of the regular monthly meeting on December 9, 2019 (moved by Mr. Crush, seconded by Ms. Higgins).

Agenda Item 6. Recognitions/Reports
CHS math teacher Nicole Barnett presented "Mathematics Connections," with several examples of advanced geometry using a compass and a straight edge. She described the rubrics she had been using for competencies in her classes, including modeling,
vocabulary and communication. She presented with her students Allen Yap, Grace Murray and Quinn Marino. Ms. Barnett presented her student Will Chorlian's work.

Student Board representatives Gaven Brown and Alice Richards provided notes on events at CHS. Just before the winter break, the high school hosted its annual winter assembly, concluding the annual canned food drive and supporting performing arts peers. In previous years CHS winter spirit week was focused on dressing up for daily themes, but this year, each day of the week was dedicated to a different “actions” theme. One day that truly stood out was dedicated to Mr. Connolly and focused on saying hello to everybody they saw. Students wore nametags and also gave a friendly hello to everyone they saw. Ms. Richards and Mr. Brown have continued to collect data for draft Policy #437 Employee-Student Relations. Working with Ms. Palley, they went through the student survey data and comments, and created a comprehensive report which they presented to the committee. The students reviewed each specific piece of the policy. Staff feedback was also discussed, as well as where student and staff opinions overlapped. They have suggested updates to the policy and specified which points were acceptable as is. They plan to report back to students and staff this month on the survey findings and express our thanks for all those who took time for the survey. Next week, students at all grade levels will be taking their mid-year and final exams for many of the classes they participate in.

Concord TV Executive Director Josh Hardy presented highlights from the organization’s annual report. As part of its 5-year contract with the City of Concord and Concord School District, an annual report is created each year. ConcordTV has streamed Poetry Out Loud alive; recorded CHS graduation, awards ceremonies and school concerts. Dr. Bass has recorded several shows. Regarding reports about low audio on Channel 6, ConcordTV had recently tested a new piece of hardware and planned to purchase and install the same item in the Board room. He said that online streaming had better sound quality. Comcast would install, when all three locations were ready.

Ms. Patterson provided an update on the Superintendent search process. NESDEC was hired to support the search and a vacancy announcement has been disseminated. The Board would have a public meeting with NESDEC on January 16 to discuss the process, to include an agenda and a timeline. While a screening committee would be assembled, the final decision would rest with the Board. Ms. Poinier asked that the search committee composition be discussed at that meeting.

Agenda Item 7. Communications and Policy Committee

Ms. Patterson noted that the Committee had met on December 16 to discuss feedback from students and staff on proposed policy #437 Employee-Student Relations. Board representatives Gaven Brown and Alice Richards had worked with Donna Palley and CHS Assistant Principal Tim Herbert to advertise the survey that was sent to CHS students, and to compile the results. They reported results from approximately 1,100 students on each of the 18 points of the policy. Ms. Palley reported on staff results from
approximately 500 teachers. She then reviewed the status of several policies related to student safety that had been addressed over the summer, noting that other student-related policies to be discussed in the near future included Policy #430/536.1 Restraint and Seclusion, and the special education manual. She also discussed a student safety strategic planning group, charged with developing a plan in response to recommendations in the Perkins report, that has gotten underway. The group includes five students, partners, parents and staff.

Agenda Item 8. Instructional Committee

Danielle Smith presented the report of the meeting on December 18, during which the annual enrollment report was presented. Enrollments had continued to decline (14% over 10 years; 2% fewer students over the last year). CHS average class size was 21. CRTC numbers have continued to grow, and programs like the mid-level health worker program were in high demand; CRTC Director Steve Rothenberg said he would like to develop a certificate program in this area. The special education student population has continued to grow (currently 15% of the total elementary population), mostly related to emotional issues. This past July, the US DOE and NH DOE dropped testing score thresholds for ELL students, meaning that 78 students no longer qualify for ELL services. In response to a question from Mr. Croteau about how the District supports homeless students, Ms. Palley noted that transportation is provided; guidance counselors/homeless liaisons provide clothing and backpacks; Title I covers meals and weekend food for students. Homeless students are covered under the McKinney-Vento Act. Mr. Crush noted that Student Services Director Bob Belmont had met with all special education parents last week to review the special education manual. He proposed moving that topic to later in the year, suggesting that work groups might address specific topics. Ms. Cannon noted that special education parents needed to feel heard, and there were at times very high emotions running through conversations. Mr. Croteau suggested that in its haste to be careful about the Policy #430 Restraint and Seclusion, the Board may have tied the hands of staff dealing with very challenging behaviors. Ms. Poinier suggested that special education teachers be present when the restraint/seclusion policy was reviewed. Ms. Patterson suggested preparing a presentation on Policy #430 Restraint and Seclusion for the January 23 meeting, and that the parent group continue to review the special education manual. She noted that the language in Policy #430 Restraint and Seclusion was very specific by NH law; but that it could be difficult to interpret this language. She suggested that the Committee consider recommendations about how to achieve a common interpretation. Mr. Crush said he was surprised that Policy #430 Restraint and Seclusion was not part of the special education manual, and that he did not plan to vote in support of it.
Agenda Item 9. Proposed calendar of meetings
Ms. Patterson discussed the proposed Board calendars for January and February, highlighting the Board retreat on January 11 at Mill Brook School. The final budget would be voted on March 26.

Agenda Item 10. Public comment
There was no public comment.

Agenda Item 11. Adjournment
The Board voted 9-0 to adjourn (motioned by Mr. Crush, seconded by Ms. Higgins).
The Board adjourned at 10:00 p.m.
Respectfully submitted,
Barb Higgins, Secretary

[Note: the membership of the 2020 Board committees is as follows:]
Capital Facilities: Jim Richards, Chair; Danielle Smith, Barb Higgins, Liza Poinier
City and Community Relations: Liza Poinier, Chair; Tom Croteau, Danielle Smith, David Parker
Communications and Policy: Jennifer Patterson, Chair; Tom Croteau, Chuck Crush, Gina Cannon
Executive: Jennifer Patterson, President; Jim Richards, Vice President; Barb Higgins, Secretary
Finance: Tom Croteau, Chair; Liza Poinier, Barb Higgins, David Parker
Instructional: Barb Higgins, Chair; Danielle Smith, David Parker, Gina Cannon
Negotiations: Chuck Crush, Chair; Jennifer Patterson, Jim Richards, Gina Cannon
School Board members: Jennifer Patterson, Gina Cannon, Tom Croteau, Barb Higgins, Jim Richards, Chuck Crush, David Parker, Liza Poinier, Danielle Smith

District administrators: Frank Bass, Donna Palley, Jack Dunn, Matt Cashman

Guest: Barrett Christina, Esq., Executive Director NHSBA

Agenda

A. Introduction and welcome
   Jennifer Patterson
B. School Board training information
   Barrett Christina
C. Committee explanations
   Jennifer Patterson

A. Ms. Patterson opened with an informal welcome and overview of the day. The Board began by discussing topics on which it was hoped the NH School Boards Association would offer guidance during the retreat. One key area was RSA 91-A Access to Governmental Records and Meetings, and how this law regulates what information from the Board can and cannot be shared with the public. Since so much of the Board’s last year was focused on the different kinds of meetings, and guidelines that go along with each, it was a good place to begin, as review for current Board members and training for new Board members.

Items such as how much public notice must be given for public and non-public meetings were discussed. Board members discussed what differentiates a non-public meeting from what is often called a “non-meeting.” The bonding process was discussed, and the “ins-and-outs” of public notices related to those meetings. The Board discussed whether inviting Superintendent Bass into a meeting would make it a public meeting. The general rule is that both public and non-public sessions must have at least 24 hours’ prior public notice while non-meetings (negotiating sessions; meeting with legal counsel) did not require public notice.

Ms. Patterson introduced Barrett Christina, Executive Director of the NH School Board Association for a morning of training.

B. Attorney Christina reviewed the NHSBA School Board Roles and Responsibilities – November 2019 packet provided to those in attendance. While the Board did not complete all 34 pages of the handout, healthy conversation centered on the key roles and responsibilities of a school board, and how Concord’s School Board functions a bit differently, as it is autonomous from the City Council.

Policymaking was the first Board responsibility discussed. It was pointed out that there is no legal difference between the term “policy” and “rule.” Attorney Christina walked the
Board through setting and establishing Board policies as well as legal requirements pertaining to Board policies.

The discussion moved to the efficient running of meetings and committee work versus full Board work. There was significant discussion on the potential ineffectiveness of rehashing detailed committee meeting minutes at a full Board meeting, compared with the need for all Board members to be educated and knowledgeable about what has taken place in committee meetings.

Board members discussed the challenges of helping the community better understand the Board's role. Sometimes community members assume that being on the Board is a full-time job; they do not understand that Board members essentially volunteer their time. Discussion on how to educate the community followed. It was reiterated that policymaking and budget approval were primary Board functions. In other communities, the school board itself participates more heavily in negotiations. Due to this Board's autonomous nature and the fact that all members vote on actual negotiated contracts and funds, CSD Board members cannot sit at the negotiations table.

The other main function of the Board is to hire and supervise the Superintendent. There was discussion on how to best execute this process as the Board prepares to hire a new permanent Superintendent. A focus on trauma and a background with crisis arose as professional characteristics needed for this community at this time. A brief discussion ensued around the supervision of superintendents by the Board, and the importance of good communication practices between the Superintendent and the Board. This segued into a discussion about how much the full Board should know about employee personnel matters when compared to the Executive Committee, and what the timing and degree of specificity of these communications can or should be.

If Board members knew too much about a given situation from one side or another, they could not function in an unbiased way should there be a personnel hearing. This balance between knowledge of a situation and remaining neutral was seen to be a fine line from a legal perspective.

Board members discussed the challenges of communicating with the public when questions arise about personnel matters. It was noted that there is not always a timeline for sharing information and oftentimes the process for legally sharing information does not allow it to be shared as quickly as members of the public expect or would like.

The Board discussed the challenge of listening to public comment without responding, which can create an aura of apathy when in fact Board members are obligated to remain impartial about potential personnel matters due to the Board's role as an appellate body. Returning emails and phone calls, while critically important, can be similarly challenging when there is no substantive information that a Board member can share.

Dr. Bass noted that timely communication and responsiveness are key areas for him as a Superintendent. Over 180 responses were received from teachers on the draft policy Employee-Student Relations survey, and he noted that the safety in which they could respond seemed to be cathartic for them.
The Board discussed other ways it could foster strong communication with the public. Ideas included setting up public forums in which to address public concerns as more of a back-and-forth discussion than is workable in a monthly Board meeting. Table set up during meetings was also discussed, including whether school administrators and Board members should sit separately, and what was the right balance between the Superintendent and Board roles.

Attorney Christina concluded the morning by encouraging Board members to take advantage of NHSBA resources, and offered to answer questions at any time.

The Board and staff members broke for a lunch break.

C. After lunch, Ms. Patterson led a review of each committee and the appointment of vice-chairs for each committee. A vision Ms. Patterson has for each Board member includes the opportunity to chair meetings and to develop specific areas of expertise, working in conjunction with Central Office staff in each area.

Following an overview of each committee by its chairperson, Board members discussed the work of each committee, highlighted success from the past year and discussed focus areas for the coming year.

Capital Facilities Committee – this committee would like to see the District develop long- and short-term maintenance goals in a revised facilities plan. This committee will also be at the forefront of the middle school facility development and will examine ways to influence the political conversation to reinforce the need for state building aid. Jim Richards is chair, Liza Poinier is vice-chair.

City and Community Relations Committee – this committee will look at the District website to improve navigation, and review work in social media and television. Board members discussed how to improve ready access to Board meetings on the website. The Committee would like to host a legislative breakfast this year and consider how to advocate for building aid. Liza Poinier is chair, David Parker is vice-chair.

Communications & Policy Committee – this committee will continue its work to update, review and revise current policies and to stay up-to-date on newly-introduced legislation that will influence policies. This committee would like information on interpreting contract language, as grievances may come to this committee. Jennifer Patterson is chair, Gina Cannon is vice-chair.

Finance Committee – this committee manages the reserve and trust funds and must be well aware of costs related to running the District: tax rate and creating options (80% is attributable to personnel costs). The committee is interested in making good choices, prioritizing, gaining state building aid, and the need to consider bonding to support a middle school project and to support older facilities (more roofing projects). Tom Croteau is chair, Barb Higgins is vice-chair.

Instructional Committee – This committee enjoys the curriculum and instruction-connected conversations as it examines 21st century learning: hands-on, project-based learning. This committee would like to consider the middle school grade range decision
(grades 5-8 or 6-8). For the coming year, the committee will focus on computer science and social studies, personalized learning, the social-emotional learning (SEL), behavior task force and career pathways. The committee will consider ways to create opportunities for Board members to visit classrooms during the coming year. Barb Higgins is chair, Danielle Smith is vice-chair.

**Negotiations Committee** – this committee has just completed a fairly challenging year with several new CBAs completed. The committee will continue to consider long-term liabilities in negotiations. The committee is interested in gaining and maintaining a competitive edge as new employees are recruited. Four contracts will need to be negotiated by June 30, 2021. Chuck Crush is chair, Jennifer Patterson is vice-chair.

**Executive Committee** – this committee meets monthly to create the agenda for the monthly meetings, and also considers significant issues as they arise in the District. This committee has some interest in being present at community events and connecting with other organizations in the community. Jennifer Patterson is President, Jim Richards is Vice President, and Barb Higgins is Secretary.

There was a final brief conversation about social media and the role of Board members thereon. A Board page was discussed as well as individual Board member pages. Mr. Croteau suggested the Board ask Mr. Christina to return to provide further training, as this was invaluable.

The retreat adjourned at 1:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Barb Higgins, **Secretary**
Board of Education, Concord School District
Special Board meeting
January 13, 2020

Board members present: Tom Croteau, Barb Higgins, Jennifer Patterson, Liza Poinier, Danielle Smith, Jim Richards, David Parker, Gina Cannon

Board member absent: Chuck Crush

Administrators: Interim Superintendent Frank Bass, Assistant Superintendent Donna Palley, Business Administrator Jack Dunn, Director of Facilities Matt Cashman, Director of Student Services Bob Belmont

Board president Jennifer Patterson opened the meeting at 5:34 p.m., noting that this special meeting was scheduled at the Board’s request for the purpose of hearing a high-level preview of FY20-21 budget factors in advance of the regularly scheduled Budget Work Sessions that would begin on February 10. She reviewed the agenda, which included personnel, FY21 budget development Board discussion, FY21 budget dates, FY22 outlook, copier contracts, athletics, and public comment. Interim Superintendent Frank Bass offered an estimated anticipated increase in the budget of $1.75 – $1.8 million in salaries/benefits after the initial pass of discussions and reviews.

Business Administrator Jack Dunn offered a moment of silence for the recent deaths of Gary Jenkins, a bus driver for the District, and Edwina Czajkowski, a former employee who initiated the highly-regarded White Farm science program, Project SEE.

Mr. Dunn provided a preview of FY21 budget considerations, including expenditures in personnel, technology and facilities; and revenue in fees, local tax rate, state education tax and grants. He reviewed the proposed FY21 Work Session dates and noted that this was a draft schedule that Board members could amend as needed.

Ms. Patterson explained to the new Board members that this was a typical budget meeting schedule, with each session focused on a specific area of the budget. She emphasized that Work Session #8, CRTC and CHS enrollments, was particularly important, as it would address staff needs, school enrollments, and class schedules. Tom Croteau commented that while Mr. Dunn and the other administrators were excellent at answering questions, it was generally best to present questions or discussion topics ahead of time, so they had time to gather data and prepare responses before the next meeting. Mr. Dunn opened the meeting for Board member questions and discussion.

Ms. Patterson asked if Mr. Dunn was able to provide an estimate or talk through the rough baseline budget number; Mr. Dunn explained that this process had just begun, and he was unable to provide numbers yet. Jim Richards asked why the dates had been flipped for the Work Sessions discussing capital facilities and salaries; Mr. Dunn explained that this was in part to give HR more time to prepare, as some staff members
have been out of the office and needed more time to gather necessary information. He added that facilities and debt service was a large and important section of the budget; he wanted to emphasize their importance and ensure Board members had enough time to understand and discuss those areas.

Interim Superintendent Frank Bass explained some of the big-ticket and important budget considerations, which include potentially hiring a District Compliance Officer, a School Resource Officer (SRO) at the middle school, and expanding support systems at the elementary level, which could entail BCBAs (Board-Certified Behavior Analysts), social workers, and/or additional special education staff. He described the possibility of a District pilot program, including shared Educational Assistants at Mill Brook School to help in kindergarten classrooms, and looking at novel ways to help offset costs of social workers and BCBAs. Dr. Bass emphasized his goal to reallocate unused or underused areas within the budget so these funds would be allocated to areas of demonstrated need. He added that he had met with the building Principals to determine their top priorities and was working to determine what made the most sense for each school while being judicious about what the budget could feasibly support.

David Parker asked if analysis had been done when examining these priorities and requests, what had been spent, and if data were gathered to assess efficacy. Dr. Bass noted that he had analyzed areas in the budget where funds were underused or unused and determined where that money might be needed and used more efficiently; this included analyzing needs building by building, to categorize where behavioral issues tended to cluster and to allocate resources to address these issues most efficiently. He explained the need to assess those behavioral issues on a case-by-case basis, as these were unique, individual cases and there was not a “one size fits all” solution. He suggested collaborative meetings among staff and families, as it was important to involve families, to best help with a child’s needs. Assistant Superintendent Donna Palley commented that the SWIS (Schoolwide Information System) program was a useful tool for sharing information within the District.

Danielle Smith asked for an update on the elementary Assistant Principals, how those positions were working out, and whether those roles had addressed some of the behavioral issues in the elementary schools. Tom Croteau thanked Dr. Bass for his analysis and echoed Ms. Smith’s question about the Assistant Principals. He recalled last year’s discussions about hiring a Communications Director and said he felt it should have been considered more strongly then and should be on the table for discussion this year. Ms. Patterson and Dr. Bass described productive discussions with CHS interim principal Mike Reardon; and that some items that should be under consideration included a potential additional Social Worker, Guidance Coordinator, and other staff to address areas of need. Dr. Bass added that he felt the duties a Communications Director would perform fall under the purview of the Superintendent and that he or any other person in this position should have the skill set to fulfill those needs.

Ms. Patterson brought up athletic programs and their sustainability within the budget. Barb Higgins provided an anecdote of a recent experience she had with the Robotics Club...
at CHS, noting that the program was currently entirely self-funded and that the Board might find a way to provide some funding within the budget for this and similar programs, instead of focusing almost solely on athletics. Ms. Palley noted that the Robotics Club had received substantial state support and grants for the last several years.

Gina Cannon asked for clarification on the new positions mentioned earlier by Dr. Bass and whether these were administrative roles. Dr. Bass and Mr. Dunn explained that none of the roles was administrative: the Guidance Coordinator was not a new role; other possible roles fall into the teacher group; and the SRO was an outsourced City of Concord police officer paid at a 75/25 split with the City, with the District paying 75%. Mr. Dunn added that the Compliance Officer and Social Workers were unaffiliated (i.e. non-union) positions. Mr. Richards clarified that Mr. Dunn would provide a line-by-line proposed budget compared with last year's, to add clarity to the overall picture.

Mr. Parker stated that he felt there was less a need for a Communications or PR Officer than there was a need for transparency from the District and the Board; that it was important that both parties communicated honestly and effectively with the community. Liza Poinier echoed Mr. Croteau’s earlier thought about considering a Communications Director in the budget process, as there was a great deal of value in such a role. She added that these duties were not a “frill,” and that having strong communications was important and something the District should aspire to. Ms. Cannon added that this role might also help with recruiting a more diverse staffing pool. Mr. Croteau suggested that perhaps developing a brief job description for the role would be a good starting point, as it would provide clarity for the goals for the role and help the District in the long run. He volunteered to work with Ms. Poinier to develop this document.

Mr. Dunn provided budget data for two types of staff positions: a teacher and an educational assistant. An average teacher position was budgeted at $99,581.81, which consisted of $59,784 in salary and $39,797.81 in benefits and retirement. An average educational assistant position was budgeted at $30,412.14, which consisted of $19,864.65 in salary and $10,547.49 in benefits. Mr. Parker asked for the average wage of the current population of teachers. Mr. Dunn explained that $59,784 was representative of budgeting MS on the teacher scale. Ms. Patterson added that salary scales were publicly available on the District website on the collective bargaining agreements page.

Mr. Dunn reviewed FY22 considerations, which included expenditures in the areas of salaries and benefits, the new New Hampshire Retirement System rate, health insurance costs, revenue within the State biannual budget, and State building aid. He explained that the State had lifted the moratorium on State building aid and that the District had filed a letter of intent to get on the list for this pool of funding. Ms. Patterson clarified that when the District received State building aid to build three elementary schools in 2011, the process was essentially first-come first-served, but now the process was primarily need-based and required more information and demonstrated need. Mr. Dunn noted that while this was a much more rigorous process with more stringent requirements, more funding would be received up front, meaning there would be less to bond. He added that the
amount available was subject to the State's available funds, and that the District was in an advantageous position with the Board governing structure.

Mr. Dunn reviewed the District's copiers, noting that the current three-year contract with Canon is up for renewal in June. He explained that the previous vendor, Ricoh, had been in place for 10 years, and when the District switched from Ricoh to Canon, the Districtwide number of copiers was decreased and a staffed copy center was installed at CHS – a unique feature for any school District in the state. The renewal offer would renew for three more years (expiring in June 2023), waive the final two payments ($61,070), add two more copiers at RMS, add additional equipment for the copy center, and change from a quarterly to an annual payment, a savings of roughly $100,000. Ms. Patterson remarked that Canon was providing an excellent program with good technology, service and substantial value and savings for the District and that, given those circumstances, perhaps the copier contract would not need to go out to bid. Mr. Richards asked if the District could get an equally good value from another vendor. Mr. Dunn explained that switching to a new vendor would mean new machines, new software, new servers, new configurations, and staff training, and that those costs would be significant even if the District did go out to bid. Mr. Richards asked Mr. Dunn if he felt the current vendor was meeting the District's and Board's strategic needs, and Mr. Dunn responded that it was.

Ms. Cannon asked when the District was required to put something out to bid vs. making a discretionary decision. Ms. Patterson and Mr. Dunn referred to Board Policy #322 Bidding. Mr. Croteau asked Mr. Dunn to provide key points in simple language on why the District should keep Canon rather than bidding out for a new copier vendor. Mr. Dunn suggested that Canon had provided good service for the past three years with seamless software and technology and high quality, reliable machines. District IT staff was comfortable with the services. He added that the amount of work and money needed to change providers would be significant and was a major detractor from that option. Mr. Richards suggested that the Board vote whether to officially bypass the bid process.

The Board voted 8-0 to bypass the bid procedure pursuant to Policy #322 and authorize Mr. Dunn to continue the District's copier service with Canon (motioned by Ms. Higgins, seconded by Ms. Patterson).

Mr. Richards commented that he did not lightly support bypassing the bidding process, but had faith in the thoroughness and significant savings analysis Mr. Dunn provided. He asked that Mr. Dunn prepare an analysis of the service renewal proposal and associated savings to present to the Finance Committee.

Mr. Dunn presented the issue of the JV hockey budget, noting that the program was initially conveyed as revenue neutral, without an end date for when or whether it would cease being revenue neutral.

- Excerpt from the Instructional Committee minutes of September 5, 2018:
  "A budget proposal to fund this program after the first year would need to be made through the regular District budget process." page 1 of 5, Voted 4-0.
Excerpt from the Board meeting minutes of October 1, 2018:

"The Board voted 8-0 to approve the revenue-neutral addition of Junior Varsity Ice Hockey for the 2018-2019 school year" page 5 of 9, Voted 8-0.

Mr. Croteau said his understanding was that the program was a proposal rather than a firm budget line item. Ms. Patterson noted that the minutes from meetings when this was discussed were available on the District website, dated September 5, 2018 and October 1, 2018. Ms. Higgins asked if the issue was that the JV hockey program was now in the budget. Ms. Patterson said the assumption was that the program would be budget-neutral for FY18-19 and would be incorporated into the budget the following year, but that the Board had not specifically discussed the actual costs of the program or whether it would remain budget-neutral. She added she would like to see a presentation on the actual costs of the program. Ms. Poinier remarked that it might be worth reviewing other athletic programs and costs for students and programs with strong booster activity, as a way to determine if there are programs that may need more support. She referenced Ms. Higgins' earlier comments about support for the CHS Robotics Club and similar programs that reach larger student populations. Mr. Croteau expressed concern that such an analysis by the Board might set a precedent that sports programs were annually on the cutting block. He said there were many students, particularly at RMS, who could and did benefit from athletics programs, and the Board needed to be careful about how these programs were treated with respect to fairness for all students and families. Mr. Richards emphasized that this was the time of year these issues should be addressed as it was the beginning of budget season. Ms. Higgins noted that student engagement was very important, that there was a need to visualize the bigger picture, and that sometimes the way to reach students was through extracurricular programs, clubs and athletics, not just math and sciences, for example. Mr. Parker noted that the City offered many additional athletic and recreational programs and that the Board should review those community resources, as the District should not need to shoulder everything. He added that it was important to allow scholarships and boosters for some of these students.

Mr. Dunn noted that he and Dr. Bass have had meetings with City officials as part of the City and Community Relations Committee (formerly the Joint City Council/School Board Committee), in which they had discussed shared gym time, activity schedules, transportation for City programs, and other relevant topics. He noted that he would add the athletics topics to the curriculum and technology Work Session agenda. The Assistant Principal positions would be addressed at the Work Session on student services.

Ms. Patterson opened the meeting for public comment, in accordance with Policy #136.

Concord resident and 58-year taxpayer Betty Hoadley asked if Board policy #690.1 Athletic Philosophy and Guidelines, on adding and dropping sports, was ever discussed during the JV hockey discussions. She said she did not feel the Board was serious enough about how that program was budgeted, and emphasized that it was important that Board members were clear and persistent about requests for information and answers during the budget process. Ms. Hoadley noted that sabbatical applications should include
specific information on how the applicant would grow professionally from their sabbatical time, and how they would share that growth and development with the District. She emphasized that it was important when planning the budget to determine if there were any required procedures, such as documentation or legal needs. She noted that ideally, each Board member should have an area or two of expertise in which they could be an in-house expert. She added that it was important for committee members to check and be responsible for the veracity of meeting minutes to ensure meeting content was accurately recorded. She stated that being a Board member was a difficult role that required considerable work, and summarized her key points of advice to the Board: 1. Do not hesitate to ask penetrating questions, 2. Find out and be clear if something is a need or a want, 3. If you're on a committee, you own it – including any decisions and inconsistencies; if it came through your committee, it is yours. 4. Take advantage of the opportunity to correct the record and be sure the meeting minutes are accurate. Ms. Hoadley added that it was important to touch on student charges for activities and to examine which students were being served, as well as the relationship between City and school programs.

There was no further public comment.

Mr. Parker said that, as a new Board member, he brought fresh eyes to the situation and added that while history, protocol, and policies were important, fresh eyes and perspective were also important and had value, and that Board members should feel comfortable questioning everything.

The Board voted 8-0 to adjourn (moved by Barb Higgins, seconded by Danielle Smith).

The meeting adjourned at 7:12 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Barb Higgins, Secretary
Lauren Hynds, Recorder
Board members present: Jennifer Patterson, Jim Richards, Chuck Crush, David Parker, Gina Cannon, Danielle Smith, Barb Higgins, Liza Poinier

Board member absent: Tom Croteau

Administrator: Jack Dunn, Business Administrator

Board president Jennifer Patterson called the meeting to order at 5:35 p.m., noting that the agenda was to discuss the process and schedule for seeking a permanent Superintendent, and introduce Board members to the NESDEC representatives, Carolyn Burke, Judy King, and Executive Director Dr. Art Bettencourt.

Ms. Patterson explained that hiring a Superintendent is a core Board function and that it is the Board’s duty to do a thorough search using a strong process. She emphasized the importance and high degree of community involvement needed and that there would be ample opportunity for community input, including a survey and focus groups which will help the Board understand what the community is looking for in a new Superintendent. She noted that some steps of the process will be confidential, including meetings of the screening committee, which will involve reviewing applications and resumes. She emphasized that transparency is also important and that, while the screening committee meetings will necessarily be confidential, the process of forming the screening committee will be transparent and the committee makeup will fairly reflect community constituencies. She clarified that the purpose of the screening committee would be to bring forward multiple candidates to the Board for its review and ultimate decision. The Board will contact candidate references and thoroughly review all application materials for those being considered for the role.

Gina Cannon asked whether the full Board would review all candidate applications or only the applications of candidates brought forward by the screening committee.

Dr. Bettencourt explained that while NESDEC was available to assist with the schedule and process, ultimately this would be the Board’s search, not NESDEC’s. The schedule that was presented was a rough draft which the Board needed to review and finalize. Dr. Bettencourt explained that typically a screening committee would recommend three to five candidates, who at that point become publicly known, and begin the interview and reference check process. The Board could meet and interview any qualified candidate, not just those brought forward by the screening committee. NESDEC would assist the screening committee to find qualified candidates and advise on the process.
Ms. Cannon stated that it was her understanding, then, that the Board was not required to review application materials for every candidate; Ms. Patterson confirmed that the Board could, but was not required to.

Liza Poinier asked about the process and its immediate first steps. Dr. Bettencourt explained that the process had begun with the job posting on several websites and in hard copy via a letter, with more advertising to come. He added that applications had begun arriving at the NESDEC office and that, since the deadline was not until February 19, the timeline was looking strong. Dr. Burke explained that NESDEC would not be reviewing applications; but would rather ensure that applicants are qualified, and all application materials are complete. All qualified and complete applications are turned over to the screening committee for review.

In response to a question from Chuck Crush whether this was a nationwide search, Dr. Bettencourt explained that it was. He said an ad would run in Education Week the week of January 22.

Dr. Bettencourt reviewed materials, which included a draft search timeline and the job posting, noting that the anticipated start date for the new Superintendent was July 1, 2020, subject to adjustment based on various factors. Regarding the community needs assessment, he explained this was crucial, as it would provide valuable input on skills, traits, style, and experience which the next Superintendent should possess. The assessment was based on three “prongs:" an online survey, community/staff focus groups, and face-to-face meetings between NESDEC and various municipal figures such as the Concord Chief of Police and others who work closely with District leaders and could provide additional valuable input. He said these steps should ideally occur between now and the first week of February, with the goal of a finalized candidate profile by mid-February, which will be used by the screening committee while interviewing candidates.

NESDEC’s first meeting with the screening committee was proposed for February 24, at which a schedule/timeline would be developed, role of the committee would be discussed, and a decision-making process discussed. Ms. Patterson noted that this date falls during school vacation week.

Dr. Bettencourt emphasized that while the screening committee would play an important role in the search process, it would ultimately be the Board’s decision who to hire. He emphasized that the confidentiality of the screening committee meetings would be impressed upon committee members. The committee will review all qualified, complete application packets sent forward by NESDEC; narrow the list to 10-12 applicants; schedule and interview those applicants; and recommend three to five candidates to the full Board for consideration. Once those individuals are brought forward to the Board, they become public; this is when the community would be exposed to the candidates and become part of the process. Dr. Bettencourt explained that, ideally, the Board would make its final decision in the March-April timeframe, to provide a helpful transition period for the incoming Superintendent to visit the District and begin meeting stakeholders.
Mr. Crush asked who would conduct salary and benefits negotiations with the final candidate. Dr. Bettencourt explained that NESDEC would be available to help with this process, including contract models and recommendations, but that it was generally done by the Board. He added that NESDEC would discuss individual requirements with candidates in advance; if a candidate was being seriously considered whose requirements might be out of the Board's range, NESDEC would discuss this with the Board.

Dr. Burke and Ms. King then reviewed the online survey and focus group processes and timelines. Dr. Burke discussed the plan for conducting focus groups, including its timeline, and recommended the week of February 3 and/or 10. The focus groups should be conducted on back-to-back days and would involve parents, faculty, administration, community members, and students. She explained that these would be in a casual, round-robin style and that participants could drop in for as little or as much time as they wanted. She noted that offering both focus groups and the online survey would allow maximum participation from those with differing communication preferences, and that NESDEC would help the Board plan and conduct these groups. The Board will use data compiled from the survey results and focus groups to draft an ideal candidate profile.

Ms. Patterson recommended the week of February 3 for the focus groups, as there was only one Board meeting scheduled for that week. She added that there are twice-weekly Board meetings in February due to the budget planning meetings, and that another meeting should be scheduled as soon as the focus groups were over in order to develop the candidate profile, in advance of the screening committee's first proposed meeting on February 24.

Dr. Burke explained that NESDEC would summarize community input from the focus groups and create a draft candidate profile to distribute to the Board ahead of its meeting. The benefits and possible challenges of several dates in early March were discussed; March 4 and 10 from 5:30-7:30 p.m. were selected. Dr. Bettencourt suggested keeping the date when final candidates are announced open, to allow for the screening committee to not be locked into a specific date. Dr. Burke recommended mid-March for meeting, interviewing, and determining/releasing the name of the candidate finalists. Jack Dunn confirmed that the dates discussed did not conflict with presently-scheduled budget work sessions. Dr. Bettencourt agreed to revamp the meeting calendar provided in the meeting folder and distribute to Board members.

Mr. Crush suggested the focus groups be advertised as quickly as possible to give people ample time to plan. Ms. Poinier asked about the typical number of focus groups. Dr. Burke stated that six to seven groups are typical, with some daytime and some evening sessions for community, parents, staff, and students. Mr. Crush recommended at least three parent/community focus groups to maximize input from those demographics. In response to a question from Mr. Richards whether parent and community member meetings should be joint or separate, Dr. Burke explained that most community members who attend these meetings are also parents, and that many people prefer the online survey option, so focus group numbers are not as large as they used to be. Ms. Poinier asked if the survey had already been developed or if it is newly created. Dr. Bettencourt
explained that NESDEC has a proprietary survey, which provides good guidance for
input and focus group discussions which consists of some forced-choice questions and
several free-response questions. Ms. Cannon suggested community involvement might be
high, given the events that have led to the search for a new Superintendent; several Board
members remarked that feedback and input was welcomed and encouraged.

Mr. Crush asked if community members such as the Mayor and Police Chief would be
part of the focus groups or would be individually interviewed. Dr. Burke explained that
this could go either way; that their input is entered the same as any other participant.
David Parker stated that he felt it was important to involve those individuals in the focus
groups and invite them to be part of those conversations. Ms. Patterson suggested the
Board work with Mr. Dunn to determine more specific time and location details so the
Board could focus on more high-level Board items.

Ms. Poinier clarified that the focus group responses would be transcribed but not
electronically recorded. She added that several local reporters would probably want to
attend these focus groups. Dr. Burke explained that people would be welcome to speak to
reporters if they wished, but that attendees would be discouraged from recording video
or taking photos of meeting charts or materials. Dr. Bettencourt explained that the press
was generally very cooperative.

6-7 groups:
(3) Parent/community morning/(2) evening
Teacher/staff and (1) school administration
Government/civic leaders – mayor, councilors, local business, police chief, etc.
suggested by Mr. Richards
High school students

Survey and focus group results and updates could be discussed at Board meetings

Ms. Cannon asked if City Council members should be invited to be part of focus groups.
Ms. Patterson agreed this could be a good idea and asked if there was a limit to the
number of focus groups that could be held. Dr. Bettencourt explained that there was no
maximum number and NESDEC would work with the number of meetings scheduled,
but that six to seven was a common/average number. Ms. Poinier suggested finding a
time when Mayor Bouley, City Manager Tom Aspell, and Director of the Chamber of
Commerce Tim Sink were all available, as they might provide valuable input. Dr. Burke
emphasized that the most important thing was to get the word out to the community
about the focus groups to encourage maximum participation. Dr. Bettencourt clarified
that no one would be precluded from attending any focus group; the goal was to get the
best possible input and encourage people to respond as honestly as possible. Mr. Croteau
suggested calling and personally inviting some community members to these meetings.

Ms. Patterson suggested a discussion about the composition of the screening committee in
order to find the best balance of constituencies. She noted that the previous screening
committee was composed of three Board members, two Central Office administrators, three building administrators, one high school student, one teacher, one special education teacher, two parents, and two community representatives. Dr. Bettencourt explained that try as much as possible to balance the number of teachers, parents, and community members, and to look at the constituencies the Board feels are important to involve in the process. Mr. Parker suggested the screening committee have more teachers and only one or two Central Office administrators, as there should be more emphasis on people who work with kids every day, such as teachers and paraeducators. Barb Higgins recommended a principal, teacher, and support staff member from each school level: elementary, middle, and high. Ms. Patterson asked how large these groups should be and what would be considered too large. Dr. Bettencourt recommend 12-13 members but added that these groups generally end up with 17-18 members and that NESDEC is familiar with this. He explained that it was important to create the balance the Board wanted and that NESDEC would work with whatever they came up with. Dr. Burke noted that the group would meet approximately six times. Ms. Patterson suggested the group have two or three Board members. Mr. Crush recommended two Board members, one Central Office administrator, three principals (one from each school level), one high school student, two teachers, one special education teacher, three parents with at least one of those with a student receiving special education services (IEP/504 Plan), one or two community or civic representatives, and one or two support staff or paraprofessionals. 

Mr. Dunn noted that representatives from the Friends Program and Chamber of Commerce were the participating civic entities on the last search committee. Ms. Higgins emphasized the importance of keeping grade-level representation even across demographics to ensure all school levels were represented. Ms. Patterson recommended Mr. Dunn as the Central Office representative and asked the best way to select parents and community representatives, noting the significant time commitment the task will require. Mr. Crush asked if advertising for committee participation might be a good idea, if the posting was clear about the time commitment involved. Ms. Patterson suggested looking first to parents who have actively participated in recent Board meetings. Dr. Bettencourt noted that there was still a good amount of time to reach out to potential participants since the screening committee would not meet until March. He added that sometimes it was as difficult to select the screening committee as it was to select the Superintendent, as these were both important decisions. He recommended approaching each constituency, asking them to recommend participants, or to have a specific person in mind to ask. Mr. Richards noted that the District has only one high school principal and one middle school principal, and that the Board may want to consider the high school’s assistant principals.

Ms. Patterson noted that Danielle Smith and Mr. Croteau had expressed interest in being the Board’s representatives on the committee and asked to have a discussion about what made sense and how much work Board members would want to take on. Mr. Richards expressed support for these recommendations, explaining that Mr. Croteau had served on the Board for a long time, and had considerable leadership experience. He agreed that Ms. Smith was also a good selection as she was a District parent who was active in the schools
and provides thoughtful input as a Board member. Ms. Patterson offered to serve as the liaison for NESDEC but not on the screening committee, given the time commitment of being Board president. Dr. Burke noted there would be ample opportunity for Board member involvement with candidate interviews and introductions to the community once finalists have been chosen.

Dr. Bettencourt explained that NESDEC did not typically interface with the press and suggested a Board member on the screening committee serve as a spokesperson between the Board and the public or press. Mr. Richards offered a reminder that the Board was entering budget season and that anyone considering volunteering for these additional roles and tasks avoid overcommitting. Ms. Patterson suggested Mr. Croteau would be a good committee spokesperson and could work with her as spokespersons for the full Board. In response to a question from Mr. Parker about his experience with the press during these hiring processes, Dr. Bettencourt explained that most press members seek updates on the process and do not ask particularly probing questions. Mr. Parker suggested the City and Community Relations Committee might determine these roles; that he would feel more comfortable with an official recommendation from one of these committees instead of volunteering Mr. Croteau in his absence. Mr. Crush stated that proactive communication through all stages of the process was important. Dr. Burke explained that everything should be posted on the Board website: timelines, procedural information, etc. Mr. Richards agreed that this information should be always available to the community, students, and staff as everyone has a vested interest in the outcome of the Superintendent search. Mr. Dunn reminded everyone that the Superintendent’s assistant should be utilized as much as possible regarding organization and communication. Ms. Patterson suggested adding a dropdown menu about the Superintendent search on the Board web page as a good place to gather and organize information. Ms. Cannon echoed the importance of proactive communication and solicitations for participation. Ms. Patterson noted that once information was posted on the website, it would be very easy to send links to anyone Board members wanted to approach for participation.

Dr. Bettencourt explained that it was not too early to start thinking about the new Superintendent’s contract, and that the Board might want to work with District attorneys and at past contracts to see if anything needed to be updated, as it would want to have many issues decided in advance of actually finding a successful candidate. He added that it might also be a good idea to look at and update the Superintendent job description to ensure responsibilities and goals were accurate. He recommended having informational documents about the District budget and strategic plans available for potential candidates, and remarked that the Board website was very good and informative and that NESDEC would direct potential candidates there. He suggested Board members prepare for questions from the public about why some portions of process were public and some were not.

Ms. Patterson suggested that she, Mr. Dunn, Ms. Smith, and Mr. Croteau meet in the very near future and determine a list of people to ask to participate. She explained that the Superintendent search process could be discussed at any posted Board meeting, and that
the Executive Committee had added the search as a standing agenda item. The next full Board meeting is on February 3.

The Board voted 8-0 to adjourn (motioned by Ms. Higgins, seconded by Mr. Crush).

The meeting adjourned at 7:26 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Barb Higgins, Secretary
Lauren Hynds, Recorder
TO: Members, Concord School Board  
FROM: Larry Prince, Director of Human Resources  
DATE: February 3, 2020  
REFERENCE: Teacher Nominations 2019-2020 School Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Certification</th>
<th>Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allison Shippos</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>Occupational Therapist</td>
<td>State of New Hampshire</td>
<td>Merrimack Valley School District, Penacook, NH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bow, NH</td>
<td>Occupational Therapist</td>
<td>SUNY Downstate Health Sciences University, Brooklyn, NY, B.S./00</td>
<td>Occupational Therapist, exp. 12/31/21</td>
<td>Occupational Therapist, 18-present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nashua School District, Nashua, NH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Occupational Therapist, 14-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Occupational Therapist, 01-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Genesis Healthcare, Concord, NH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Occupational Therapist, 15-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Occupational Therapist, 06-08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Heritage Healthcare, Boscawen, NH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Occupational Therapist, 11-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PRN Occupational Therapist, 14-present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SYNERTX Rehabilitation, Boscawen/Concord, NH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Occupational Therapist, 08-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alexandria Country Day School, Plainview, NY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Occupational Therapist, 00-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allinson replaces</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Allison replaces Jennifer Hume (60% M-1 = $12,407 prorated 78 days)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Hume</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- resignation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40% New Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60% Budgeted at $19,553</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$28,862  
B-10  
prorated 79 days
School Safety Compliance Officer

A full-time, 200 day-position

The School Safety Compliance Officer is responsible for coordinating the District's efforts to comply with applicable Federal and State laws and regulations, and District policies regarding student safety. The Officer oversees the District's duty to address in a prompt and equitable manner, any inquiries or complaints regarding discrimination, harassment, bullying, retaliation or denial of equal access. The Officer facilitates the investigation and resolution of informal reports and formal complaints. The Officer, who serves as the District's Title IX Coordinator, is the District-wide resource in matters related to student safety. This position develops and implements educational programs regarding discrimination, harassment and bullying prevention, ensuring faculty, staff, students and families understand their rights and, where applicable, responsibilities under the law. The Officer collaborates with district and school administrators, staff, local agencies and organizations, to identify and address systemic problems and solutions.

Minimum Job Requirements

- Master's degree in a related field; at least 5 years of experience related to the duties and responsibilities specified. Further advanced degree(s) may be substituted for years of experience.
- Relevant professional training or certification, such as ATIXA Certification preferred

Compensation

- $80,000-$95,000, depending on education and experience
- Competitive benefits package

Reports to: Superintendent of Schools

Knowledge, Skills, and Abilities

- Knowledge of federal, state, and district policies and practices specific to the applicable compliance area.
- Experience in conducting investigations under relevant policies, including report writing, conducting interviews, and complaint resolution, in a highly professional, sensitive, trauma-responsive and confidential manner.
- Ability to assess and negotiate highly complex, confidential and sensitive matters while maintaining objectivity and neutrality
- Superior analytical abilities, excellent attention to detail and strong problem-solving skills
- Strong organizational skills and a demonstrated ability to maintain detailed and thorough records of reports and investigations
- Skill in examining and revising operations and procedures, assisting in the development of policy, and developing and implementing new strategies and procedures.
- Strong understanding of the complexities surrounding investigations in an educational setting
- Ability to gather data, compile information and prepare reports.
- Experience in the successful development and implementation of educational and training programs with strong presentation and facilitation skills on difficult topics with diverse constituencies
- Strong interpersonal and written and oral communication skills
- Ability to work effectively with a wide range of constituencies in a diverse community.
- Ability to handle confidential and sensitive situations with diplomacy and excellent judgment.
Job Responsibilities

**Education and Outreach**

- Maintain current knowledge of the relevant laws, regulations, policies, procedures and best practices and trends related to student safety.
- Work collaboratively with district and school leadership to develop, implement, coordinate and conduct educational programs, initiatives, and training designed to educate and support employees, students and families about requirements under state and federal laws and regulations, district policies and procedures regarding discrimination, harassment, bullying, and retaliation.
- Provide ongoing support and training to administrators and district- and building-level staff.
- Provide ongoing training, consultation and technical assistance for District staff, students and families.
- Prepare and disseminate up-to-date educational material, including brochures, posters, web-based materials and other resources that inform members of the District and community of the areas addressed by the Student Safety Office.
- Ensure that others involved with processing complaints are adequately trained in compliance with laws, regulations and policies.
- Serve as a liaison to relevant committees and workgroups.
- Support efforts to foster a community of respect that aims to prevent discrimination, harassment, bullying, retaliation and other student safety concerns.
- Develop and maintain collaborative partnerships with local law enforcement, victim advocate, child protection and other agencies.
- Ensure that all constituents have access to student safety-related resources.

**Complaints and Investigations**

- Conduct intake on reports of discrimination, harassment, bullying, retaliation, sexual violence, and other related complaints.
- Inform complainants about the district’s complaint procedures, including information about rights, options, and resources, assist individuals in filing complaints, when needed.
- Facilitate the provision of interim protective measures, as needed.
- Act as a neutral independent investigator to conduct prompt, thorough, confidential, trauma-responsive, unbiased investigations of reported incidents by interviewing all parties and relevant witnesses and by identifying and gathering other information and documents relevant to the resolution of the complaint. Prepare detailed investigative reports including factual findings and credibility analysis and communicate with parties regarding process status and complaint outcomes.
- Coordinate referrals to other administrators, law enforcement, child protection, victim advocacy and other relevant organizations.
- Support the hiring of external consultants, if needed, facilitating scheduling for interviews and hearings, and maintaining communications with the complainants and respondents.
- Organize and maintain records of each complaints filed including all formal and informal. At least annually, review complaint files to ensure that the district’s complaint procedures and timelines are consistently followed, and to identify any patterns and repeat offenders.

**Reporting and Communicating Regarding Student Safety in the District**

- Regularly review district and building publications, including student and faculty handbooks, to ensure that they include consistent and up-dated information about student safety policies, procedures and resources.
• Ensure that copies of complaint and reporting procedures and any related methods of reporting are accessible and available in each school building and online for students, staff, parents, and others.
• Communicate with local law enforcement and government agencies to ensure reports are handled appropriately and in a timely manner.
• Coordinate with local victim advocacy organizations and service providers.
• Ensure that the District complies with all laws and regulations regarding posting of information about student safety.
• Assist in investigating and preparing responses to discrimination and harassment complaints filed with federal, state or local agencies, coordinating with district legal counsel, as needed.
• Coordinate with district administration and legal counsel regarding relevant Right-to-Know requests.

Collaboration with School Board and Administration

• Support the School Board Communication and Policy Committee to review and revise polices regarding student safety, as needed.
• Serve as a resource for School Board, administration and district- and building-level staff about student safety.
• Identify systemic problems relating to complaints and determine whether district-wide resources should be adopted in response.
• Ensure ongoing compliance by collecting and analyzing data, and writing reports, upon request.

Perform other duties as assigned.
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Date: January 8, 2020

Committee members present: Jennifer Patterson, Chair; Tom Croteau, Gina Cannon, Chuck Crush

Other Board member present: Barb Higgins

Administration: Donna Palley

Students present: Gaven Brown, Alice Richards

Committee chair Jennifer Patterson called the meeting to order at 5:35 p.m. The agenda was to recap the December 15, 2019 meeting; review proposed policy #437 Employee-Student Relations; and discuss the timeline for policy work through June 2020.

Donna Palley reviewed activities in fall 2019, when approximately 1,100 students and 500 staff members were surveyed about their opinions of 13 statements included in the NHSBA model policy GBEBB Employee-Student Relations, as well as the following five additional recommendations from Attorney Perkin’s September 2019 report. At the December meeting, Ms. Palley had presented a summary of staff and student feedback on each element (see attached). The purpose of this meeting was to recommend changes consistent with the areas of consensus.

Ms. Patterson noted that the level of detail provided by Ms. Palley and the students at the December meeting had been helpful to identify those strong areas of consensus that could be immediately put in place. Gaven Brown said there was a significant area of consensus between the students and faculty on a number of points in the draft language.

There was discussion about effective communication of this and other safety-related policies, including at PTO meetings, inclusion in handbooks, via the CHS Live show, etc.

After Ms. Patterson described the NHSBA model policy and its numbering scheme, Ms. Palley displayed the proposed, revised language of the policy.

The committee discussed the phrase “Unless necessary to serve an educational or health-related purpose” which preceded each of the 18 statements. Ms. Patterson suggested taking this out and adding it as preface only for those items to which it would apply. The pros and cons of this approach were discussed as the committee worked through the elements of the policy.

No. 1 – the original statement was, “Staff members shall not make derogatory comments to students regarding the school and/or its staff.”
Adding more information about respectful vs. derogatory speech was suggested. Ms. Palley brought up the issue of free speech; that while “derogatory” is by definition “disrespectful,” students were concerned about quashing employees’ freedom of speech. Mr. Brown noted that it was advisable to know the right audience with whom to have certain conversations. It was agreed to delete “and/or its staff” and instead end the first sentence with “employees or students.” The sentence “This does not prohibit constructive criticism.” was also added. The final language was: “Employees shall not make derogatory comments to students regarding the school, employees or students. This does not prohibit constructive criticism.”

No. 2 – the original statement was, “Staff shall be forbidden to give anything of value to students except reward/awards authorized by the administration.” (recommended in the Perkins report) The suggested language was, “The exchange of purchased gifts between staff members and students is discouraged.” Ms. Patterson noted that any exchange of gifts must be consistent with the principles of the NH Code of Ethics and Code of Conduct, which reads, in part, “… exchange of purchased gifts between staff members and students is discouraged.” and “Consider the potential implications and possible perception of accepting from or giving gifts to students.” Ms. Palley agreed this language should be included, but asked whether the committee wanted teachers discouraged from giving gifts, or whether that would be all right under certain circumstances. The committee decided on the following language, “The giving or receiving of purchased gifts between employees and students must be consistent with the NH Code of Ethics for NH Educators, which requires consideration of the potential implications and possible perception of giving or accepting gifts. There should never be an expectation of reciprocity with regard to a gift.”

No. 3 – the original statement, “Staff members shall not fraternize, written or verbally, with students except on matters that pertain to school-related issues” was deleted.

No. 4 – the original statement was, “Staff members shall not associate with students in any situation or activity which could be considered sexually suggestive or involve the presence or use of tobacco, alcohol or drugs.” After discussion, the committee revised the sentence to read, “Employees shall not associate with students in any situation which could be considered sexually suggestive. Employees will not encourage or facilitate the use of tobacco, alcohol or drugs by students.”

No. 5 – the original statement was, “Staff members may not have any personal social media contact with students.” After discussion about texting, about sports teams’ and clubs’ use of social media, the fact that students and staff might be family friends or family, the committee decided on the following sentence: “Employees are strongly discouraged from socializing with students on social networking platforms or via other electronic communications, consistent with the provisions of Policy #434.”

No. 6 – the original statement was, “Dating between staff members and students is prohibited.” This was left unchanged but was moved up to second in the list.

No. 7 – the original statement, “Staff members shall not use insults or sarcasm against students as a method of forcing compliance with requirements or expectations” was revised
to read, "Staff members shall not use insults or intimidation against students as a method of forcing compliance with requirements or expectations."

**No. 8** – the original statement was, "Staff members shall maintain a reasonable standard of care for the supervision, control and protection of students commensurate with their assigned duties and responsibilities." Other than changing "Staff members" to Employees, this sentence was not revised. The suggestion was made to define "reasonable standard of care," perhaps in an attached Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) document.

**No. 9.** – the original statement was, "Staff members shall not send students on personal errands." In addition to changing "Staff members" to Employees, this sentence was revised to read, "Employees shall not send students on errands that don't pertain to school."

**No. 10** – the original statement was, "Staff members shall, pursuant to law and Board policy #432/537, immediately report any suspected signs of child abuse or neglect." In addition to changing "Staff members" to Employees, this statement was moved to first in the list.

**No. 11** – the original statement was, "Staff members shall not attempt to counsel, assess, diagnose or treat a student's personal problem relating to sexual behavior, substance abuse, mental or physical health and/or family relationships and instead, should refer the student to the appropriate individual or agency for assistance." The phrase "beyond the bounds of their training and role" was added, the word "counsel" was deleted, and "Staff members" was changed to "Employees." The final statement reads, "Employees shall not, beyond the bounds of their training and role, attempt to assess, diagnose or treat a student's personal problem relating to sexual behavior, substance abuse, mental or physical health and/or family relationships and instead, should refer the student to the appropriate individual or agency for assistance."

**No. 12** – the original statement was, "Staff members shall not disclose information concerning a student, other than directory information, to any person not authorized to receive such information. This includes, but is not limited to, information concerning assessments, ability scores, grades, behavior, mental or physical health and/or family background." "Staff members" was changed to "Employees." The suggestion was made to define "directory information" and "person authorized to receive," perhaps in a FAQ.

**No. 13** – the original statement was, "Staff members shall not be alone in a room with students with a door closed, a locked door, or with the lights off." This statement was discussed at length, focused on obstructed windows, lights, door locks, and emergency situations, and was revised to read, "A room occupied by both any student with any employee must have a door that is unlocked, with an unblocked window, except during drills or emergencies, or as necessary to serve educational or health-related purposes."

**No. 14** – the original statement was, "Staff members shall not provide transportation to students and vice versa unless the school administration and student parent/guardian receive prior notice of the transportation arrangements and give consent, except in an emergency." After discussion, the committee revised the sentence to read, "Employees shall not provide transportation to students and vice versa unless the school administration and
student parent/guardian receive prior notice of the transportation arrangements and give
consent, except in an emergency or extraordinary circumstance, in which case notifications
would occur as soon as possible."

No. 15 – the original statement was, “Staff are discouraged from socializing with students
outside of school and are required to disclose any relationship with students that require in-
person contact outside of school or school-sanctioned events, such as employment or family
relationships.” (Perkins) This item was deleted.

No. 16 – the original statement was, “Staff are forbidden from hugging students or engaging
in any physical contact with a student other than as a momentary hand on a shoulder or arm,
or a handshake/fist bump outside of child restraint as it is defined in other policies/laws.”
This item was deleted.

The final paragraph was unchanged.

The word “employee(s)” will be substituted in all cases for “staff member(s).”

The committee voted 4-0 to recommend to the full Board that proposed Policy #437
Employee-Student Relations be adopted, with changes as discussed (motioned by
Mr. Croteau, seconded by Mr. Crush).

There was some discussion about communicating this policy work back to the school
community. Ms. Patterson, as a member of the committee, would join Gaven and Alice on
CHS Live. Ms. Cannon noted that the average rate of return to a survey was between 5 and
7%, and this response was phenomenal. Ms. Palley clarified that time was made available
during classes, and students were expected to complete the survey.

The committee discussed the timeline for further policy work. Given the upcoming focus on
the budget, policy work will continue with stakeholder discussions, and the committee will
review the results in April or May after the budget has been passed. Ms. Patterson noted that
the committee would meet on January 23 to discuss Policy #536 Restraint/Seclusion and hear
from people who have been involved in implementing this policy.

A motion was made to adjourn.

Committee members voted 4-0 to adjourn (motioned by Mr. Croteau, seconded by
Mr. Crush).

The meeting adjourned at 7:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jennifer Patterson, Chair
Linden Jackett, Recorder
Concord School District Policy #437
Employee - Student Relations

Employees are expected to maintain courteous and professional relationships with students, maintain an atmosphere conducive to learning, through consistently and fairly applied discipline and established professional boundaries. Employees are expected to adhere to the Code of Ethics and the Code of Conduct for NH Educators.

1. Employees shall, pursuant to law and Board policy, immediately report any suspected signs of child abuse or neglect.

2. Dating between employees and students is prohibited.

3. Employees shall not make derogatory comments to students regarding the school, employees or students. This does not prohibit constructive criticism.

4. The giving or receiving of purchased gifts between employees and students must be consistent with the NH Code of Ethics for NH Educators, which requires consideration of the potential implications and possible perception of giving or accepting gifts. There should never be an expectation of reciprocity with regard to a gift.

5. Employees shall not associate with students in any situation which could be considered sexually suggestive.

6. Employees will not encourage or facilitate the use of tobacco, alcohol or drugs by students.

7. Employees are strongly discouraged from socializing with students on social networking platforms or via other electronic communications, consistent with the provisions of Policy #434.

8. Employees shall not use insults or intimidation against students as a method of forcing compliance with requirements or expectations.

9. Employees shall maintain a reasonable standard of care for the supervision, control and protection of students commensurate with their assigned duties and responsibilities.

10. Employees shall not send students on errands that don't pertain to school.

11. Employees shall not, beyond the bounds of their training and role, attempt to assess, diagnose or treat a student's personal problem relating to sexual behavior, substance abuse, mental or physical health and/or family relationships but, instead, should refer the student to the appropriate individual or agency for assistance.

12. Employees shall not disclose information concerning a student to any person not authorized to receive such information. This includes but is not limited to information concerning assessments, ability scores, grades, behavior, mental or physical health and/or family background.
13. A room occupied by both any student with any employee must have a door that is unlocked, with an unblocked window, except during drills or emergencies, or as necessary to serve educational or health-related purposes.

14. Employees shall not provide transportation to students and vice versa unless the school administration and student parent/guardian receive prior notice of the transportation arrangements and give consent, except in an emergency or extraordinary circumstance, in which case notifications would occur as soon as possible.

Employees who violate this policy may face disciplinary measures up to and including termination, consistent with state law and applicable provisions of collective bargaining agreements. Any employee who witnesses or learns about any of the above behaviors shall report it to the building Principal and/or Superintendent immediately.

Adopted ____________, 2020
Corresponds to NHSBA Policy GBEBB. See also Policy 580 Student Records - Information
### Draft Policy Statement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Draft Policy Statement</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Staff members shall not make derogatory comments to students regarding the school and/or its staff.</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The exchange of purchased gifts between staff members and students is discouraged.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N - D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Staff members shall not fraternize, in writing or verbally, with students except on matters which pertain to school-related issues.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N - D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Staff members shall not associate with students in any situation or activity which could be considered sexually suggestive or involve the presence or use of tobacco, alcohol or drugs.</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Staff members may not have any personal social media contact with students.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Y - D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Dating between staff members and students is prohibited.</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Staff members shall not use insults or sarcasm against students as a method of forcing compliance with requirements or expectations.</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y - D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Staff members shall maintain a reasonable standard of care for the supervision, control and protection of students commensurate with their assigned duties and responsibilities</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Staff members shall not end students on personal errands.</td>
<td>Y - D</td>
<td>Y - D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Staff members shall, pursuant to law and Board policy, immediately report any suspected signs of child abuse or neglect.</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Staff members shall not attempt to counsel, assess, diagnose or treat a student's personal problem relating to sexual behavior, substance abuse, mental or physical health and/or family relationships but, instead, should refer the student to the appropriate individual or agency for assistance.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Y - D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Staff members shall not disclose information concerning a student, other than directory information, to any person not authorized to receive such information. This includes, but is not limited to, information concerning assessments, ability scores, grades, behavior, mental or physical health and/or family background.</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y - D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Staff members should not be alone with students in a room with a door closed, a locked door, or with the lights off.</td>
<td>Y - D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Staff members are strongly discouraged from socializing with students outside of school on social networking websites, consistent with the provisions of Policy 434. (described)</td>
<td>Y - D</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Staff members shall not provide transportation to students and vice versa unless the school administration and student parent/guardian receive prior notice of the transportation arrangements and give consent.</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y - D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Staff shall be forbidden to give anything of value to students except rewards/awards authorized by the administration</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Staff are discouraged from socializing with students outside of school and are required to disclose any relationships with students that require in-person contact outside of school or school-sanctioned events, such as employment or family relationships.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Staff are forbidden from hugging students or engaging in any physical contact with a student other than as a momentary hand on a shoulder or arm, or a handshake/fist bump outside of child restraint as it is defined in other policies/laws</td>
<td>N - D</td>
<td>N - D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Committee chair Jennifer Patterson called the meeting to order at 5:35 p.m. The agenda was to review Policy #536 Restraint/Seclusion. She noted that the language in this policy is very specific and is dictated by law. She noted that in past reviews of the policy, the committee had decided it was best to specifically follow the language of the statute.

Ms. Patterson noted that the committee was provided copies of the statute, the model policy from NHSBA, the District's policy and excerpts from Board and committee minutes related to restraint and seclusion. She said the focus of the committee meeting was to better understand how the policy is implemented in practice within the District, and to discuss whether any changes or clarifications to the policy might be appropriate. Donna Palley introduced CHS Special Education Director Michele Speckman, CHS School Psychologist Margie Borawska, BGS Principal Sue Lauze, BGS Assistant Principal Nancy Pender, and BGS School Counselor Christina Rousseau, who were in attendance to provide information to the committee about District practices and experience.

Tom Croteau noted that it would be important to hear from staff about whether the policy was practical and working for the District, and what components were working on a day-to-day basis with all kids and with staff. Chuck Crush asked whether the District should have this policy of restraint and seclusion at all. He stated that there are districts in New Hampshire that do not use seclusion, and questioned whether amending the policy might help the District move toward eliminating the practice.

Bob Belmont reflected on the history of the restraint and seclusion policy, noting that board deliberations on the issue dated back to 2003, as reflected in board and committee minutes that were provided to committee members. He focused specifically on the version of the state law that took effect in 2010, and Board's changes to the policy in December 2014, when the law was revised. He and Ms. Palley referenced guidance from the NH statute and from NHSBA. In response to Mr. Crush's concern about creating incentives for positive approaches, Mr. Belmont noted that the District's policy mentions "the use of preventive and positive behavioral interventions to manage student behavior." He mentioned that the district has adopted the inclusionary practice of all
students being included in classrooms and in schools, and that Concord has many fewer out-of-district placements than most schools in the state, and in the nation.

Ms. Palley noted that the law requires this policy. She said there was a definitional aspect to the law and the policy, and language in the Board policy adheres closely to the statute. She noted that restraint is to be used only in an emergency. The law places specific prohibitions on which kinds of restraint can be used; the length of restraints and how they are to be monitored; and how the use of restraint is connected with transportation issues. She noted that the issue of seclusion came before the legislature in about 2014, after which the Board reviewed its policy. She noted that very specific language is required in tracking and speaking about these kinds of incidents, including specific language used in letters to parents and on the forms that arise from the RSA and policy. The statute also addresses how incidents should be reviewed.

Mr. Crush asked about the difference between restraint and intentional physical contact (IPC). Mr. Belmont noted that under the policy, IPC must be reported when it occurs in response to students exhibiting aggression, misconduct or disruptive behavior.

BGS Principal Susan Lauze gave a few examples of circumstances when she might use the IPC reporting form, including taking the hand of a student and firmly bringing them along with her; escorting a student on the bus line; putting her hand on a student to keep him from running into the driveway at the bus line. She said she might use the form and notify parents even if the student’s behavior did not rise to the level of aggression, if she felt parents needed to have this information. Nancy Pender said if a student grabbed her arm and she needed to release his arm from hers, that would be another example of IPC.

Mr. Crush expressed concern about a lack of clarity as to whether IPC is a type of restraint, or something different. He was uncomfortable not having a clear understanding as a parent of when he should expect to receive notification, if IPC included basically any type of physical contact.

Ms. Palley noted that IPC is described in the statute; it is different from restraint, though the language in the RSA may not be as clear as we would like. The District’s reporting forms for the three different types of events: restraint, seclusion, and intentional physical contact. Reporting is only required for IPC under the statute when it occurs in a situation of resistance or aggression, and the category of IPC involves contact that does not rise to the level of restraint. However, as noted by the staff/administration, some events that are not required to be reported may be reported by staff as they err on the side of caution and want to make sure parents know what has occurred.

CHS Special Education Director Michele Speckman is one of the District’s five trainers who conduct crisis prevention training for the District. For many years the District used the ProAct program for this training. Since 2016, we have used the Crisis Prevention Intervention program or CPI for this purpose. She commented that the minute someone is physically stopped from doing something they want to do, that can be viewed as restraint. Michele noted that 230 people have been trained in CPI, including special
education staff, support staff, school counselors and others. The initial training for staff is two days; this first day and a half address how to prevent the use of restraint and seclusion, while the last half day is devoted to their proper implementation. She said she has also presented overviews at the schools, so that staff understand CPI, especially the preventative strategies. After the initial 2-day training, participants are required to participate in a one-day refresher every two years.

Mr. Belmont added that the District has now aligned with its insurer, Primex, for additional training, has gone from two to five trainers in-house, and has also conducted specialized CPI training focused on students with autism.

Mr. Crush asked about the availability of data around restraint and seclusion. Ms. Palley noted that districtwide data is collected and this data is reported to the Department of Education at the end of June each year. In response to a question from Mr. Crush about whether instances of IPCs were required to be reported to NH DOE, Ms. Palley indicated that this was not required, but that the District maintained a database of these incidents.

Ms. Cannon asked where most of the incidents are happening and other demographics. She asked whether students resettled here as refugees have a higher incidence of restraint or seclusion. Ms. Palley answered that most incidents of restraint or seclusion are at the elementary; very few at RMS; and almost none at high school.

In response to a question from Mr. Croteau about data entered into SWIS (School-wide Information System), Ms. Palley noted that the SWIS data is separate and different from the data on restraint and seclusion. SWIS data is compiled from office referrals.

Principal Lauze described the team that responds to student incidents, which includes the Principal, Assistant Principal, guidance counselor, program assistant, and behavior specialist (from Bill White Associates). The team meets weekly and looks at data regarding the individual students having difficulties, to determine whether we might need to schedule a meeting with family members and school staff, whether more support or training is needed, and whether another intervention should be developed. Principal Lauze said she or Nancy Pender have been present when any incident rises to the level that might require restraint. Ms. Lauze notes that this is the first time in over 16 years as a principal that an administrator has been available when a restraint has become necessary. The other significant change related to the addition of the assistant principal is that there is now a more rigorous and frequent review of individual student’s behavior plans and data allowing for revisions of plans in response to student’s needs. There have been no instances of seclusion at BGS this year.

Ms. Pender discussed the team’s behavior planning process, which includes the classroom teacher, behavior specialist, educational assistant, parent, and special education teacher. Every student that has required restraint this year has a behavior plan in place which guides the team by outlining proactive strategies for supporting the student as well as reactive strategies if loss of self—control occurs. These might include visual schedules, point sheets, use of calming tools that are effective for that child, going to a quiet space, or
offering choices. The behavior plan also addresses the avoidance of triggers, which depending on the child might include excessive prompting or unexpected transitions.

The BGS team described the process they follow in a potential restraint situation. If a student is highly elevated and/or loses control, a call comes into the office and/or the student support room. Many of the 1:1 assistants have a walkie-talkie they can use to get additional help for a student.

BGS Guidance Counselor Christina Rousseau noted that frequently she may be the first one to respond, or she will cover the Student Support Room (SSR) so that other staff can respond. She assesses the student needs. The new staff who come in response may trade out with staff who have been with the student. This gives a new perspective, allows them to think about what might be causing the upset, what the trigger might have been, or any trauma the student might have in their history. Staff often will try to encourage the student, depending on where they are, to move to a conference room, neutral area, use of a tent or quiet room. If a team member has a strong relationship, that person may come on, intervening verbally or suggesting strategies. Sometimes a student will be able to call a parent (early on), or the parent may come into school.

Principal Lauze said that restraint is very last action the team would take if there is imminent risk the child will hurt him/herself or others (banging his/her head against a cement wall, for example), for example. When the decision is made, the physical restraint is very brief – 1 to 2 minutes. The restrain often involves escorting a student to another space. The goal is to remove the student from the trigger that started the whole incident and get him/her to a quiet, space spot, or to protect their dignity. Only trained staff are involved in the restraint, and the team works as a unit, with one person observing and recording. They always have two people involved to assist the student in walking to another area and/or sitting or standing calmly without harming themselves or others.

The lead person would use calming comments, encouraging the student to gain control. She said the BGS staff was fortunate in that there was significant parental support; in most cases a parent is able to come almost immediately after the restraint. Their general practice is that Principal Lauze or Ms. Pender will call parents immediately to talk about what happened, ask the parent if anything had changed at home; and make sure any outside counselor or healthcare provider is aware of the event. If the parent cannot come to school, this can be done on the phone. They always seek input from families about these situations.

As soon as possible after the event, they debrief with all staff involved in the restraint. They try to meet the same day, or else the following morning. During the debriefing meeting, they review the event and what led up to it. They talk about triggers and strategies that could be used in the future to avoid or defuse escalation in the future. Another goal of the debriefing is to check on staff safety and emotional well-being. They complete the necessary paperwork and send a formal letter to the parent.
In response to a question from Mr. Croteau regarding the frequency with which the crisis team was called on, Principal Lauze noted that it may happen several times a week in some weeks, or less frequently in other weeks. There was one time this year that there were two calls in one day. At other times, staff may be looking for support to help a student with less intensive needs, and then one person, generally either the SSR staff or the Behavior Specialist may respond.

In response to questions from Mr. Crush, there are 350 students at BGS, 18-20 students with IEPs, under 5 restraints reported last year. She said there are significantly more this year, with three students having more events.

Mr. Crush asked how staff are being trained on trauma-informed responses. Principal Lauze noted that the entire staff has had training from expert Cassie Yackley, as well as other trainings from Project Grow. Ms. Palley noted that the District was in its third year of trauma-informed training. Ms. Rousseau noted that she also was specifically informed about a particular child’s trauma, and she works with staff around these needs.

Ms. Palley noted that she has reviewed every form that has come in this year. Mr. Belmont noted that these reports also come to his office for review. He then confers with building Principals about specific children’s needs, or patterns that have emerged that could be addressed on a systemic level.

Dr. Borawska noted that the District uses a tiered approach to make its environments trauma-responsive, with a variety of activities; ongoing support from Cassie Yackley; ongoing cohort trainings (for example, the counselors from Concord and other Grow districts together) and ongoing PD designed for specific roles (for example, administrators, special educators). New interventions have been added, including recently the Bounce Back and CBITS small group interventions. GROW team members work together to offer staff in the buildings professional learning opportunities and specific resources they can use in their classrooms. The team developed a full-day conference again this year focused on social-emotional learning.

Ms. Palley noted that workshops on self-care are offered for staff, as this is tremendously draining work. The District’s Social Emotional Learning Task Force is looking at a range of issues at all tiers of the district to support our staff and students.

In response to a question from Mr. Crush whether every school has a Grow team, Ms. Palley noted that the intent was to create a District-wide team with representatives from each building, who then go back to their schools with feedback, information about setting up a classroom so it is trauma-informed. These individuals present at faculty meetings, providing a variety of resources and information. She noted that this project was a systemic, not a child-based, initiative.

Ms. Patterson noted that this committee’s role is to adopt policies, and she was looking for connections between the policies adopted by the Board and the teams working in the schools. She asked whether there should be a policy to support the initiatives underway for proactive, positive approaches. She noted that the Restraint and Seclusion policy is
mandated by law, which limits the committee’s ability to make changes; however, some changes might be possible so long as they do not undercut the minimum requirements. She asked for input from those present on any policy changes that could clarify the standards or otherwise might help staff in the buildings.

Dr. Borawska noted that from the framework of social-emotional wellness, the classroom and school dynamics are changing, and she endorses treating social-emotional learning as a separate curriculum piece.

Ms. Palley noted that Policy #540.1 School-Wide Behavioral Interventions and Supports, adopted in September 2014, was on the list for committee review. Ms. Palley noted that there have been changes in the approach to social-emotional learning since Policy #540.1 was last reviewed, and so it could be useful to update it.

Mr. Croteau opined that PBIS and SWIS are useful for identifying problems, and making it possible to use data to figure out how to fix the problems.

Mr. Crush questioned whether another policy was needed, when the vision and mission statements seemed to address the Board’s interest in encouraging a positive ethos.

Ms. Patterson suggested that updating the existing policy on behavioral supports is a way for the Board to communicate a message to the District about the importance of having a positive approach that is proactive rather than reactive.

Mr. Croteau suggested that there is also a budget/financial component to this discussion.

Dr. Borawska agreed, commenting that more staff to support social-emotional learning is needed for this work. She also noted that at CHS last year, from Project Grow, there was a ‘mindfulness’ pilot by school counselors in their 9th grade team for 12-weeks. This year, the mindfulness program has expanded to include every single 9th grader, with cycles of 10 weeks. This is a Tier 1 process, meant to provide every child with time to develop a mindfulness practice. To build even further on this, she suggests that something has to come off the plate to allow for more training and support.

Christina Rousseau notes that the needs of children are changing.

Michele Speckman notes that there are lots of ‘boots on the ground’, but it’s not always the right ‘boot’. She sees a need for more highly-trained professional staff.

Ms. Cannon said that she had heard there was lack of clarity on the form, regarding what constitutes IPC that requires or does not require reporting, and asked whether that language should be looked at specifically. Ms. Palley noted that staff may err on the side of filling out the form in the belief that it is better to communicate than not. Mr. Croteau stated that the form does not prevent anyone from wanting to fill it out, and suggested that in-house experts could advise whether the language on the form needed to be revised.

Mr. Crush asked whether the District should reach out to other districts for what they do, and how they do it.
Ms. Patterson reiterated that under the statute and policy, reportable IPC is contact that occurs in response to aggression, misconduct, or disruptive behavior.

Ms. Palley presented restraint data for the last three years, noting that most restraints last three minutes or fewer. There were two students who experienced restraint at RMS, and all others are at elementary schools. She noted that very few ELL students have had restraints.

Mr. Belmont added that intensive, in-depth training, applying crisis intervention and prevention strategies, and putting behavior plans in place, as well as having the Assistant Principal positions, have reduced the number of incidents.

Mr. Crush noted that the seclusion number was incredibly low (only 2), and this painted a very different picture from what he had heard anecdotally.

Ms. Patterson opened the meeting to public comment, reminding the audience about Policy #136 guidelines governing public input, limiting comment to 5 minutes per person, and encouraging the submission of written comments.

Concord resident and parent Sarah Aiken said she appreciated the thoughtful comments, questions and data presented. She asked when the report needs to be made to parents: almost immediately or within two days. She suggested adding that parents be notified within two hours of a restraint. She expressed concern that the definition of IPC and its reporting exemptions in the policy did not mirror the law. She asked the committee to consider how a student being restrained would feel, suggesting that perhaps a student was not in a mindset to calm him/herself and might feel fear. She said she had heard that the number of suspensions has gone up. She said that “self-contained inclusion classrooms” are inappropriate and are not inclusive. She asked whether the behavior specialists are the right people and are trained in the right way to do the job they are doing, noting that they are not licensed or certified. She noted that it would cost the same amount of money to hire professional staff as it would to have a behavioral specialist who is not certified. She said she wanted the District to follow the law and create clear policies that are able to be followed by all. She said staff cannot have enough training when it concerns the emotional well-being of a child. She noted that human nature equates past with current behavior, and that the perception of a child based on past behavior can be cumulative.

Concord resident and parent Penny Duffy noted that she had attended a number of legislative hearings when the restraint and seclusion law was developed. She suggested the wording in the District’s policy be the same as the law. She said that IPC is not a separate category, but just another way of referring to restraint, and having a separate form makes it sound like a separate category. She said not to put the entire RSA in the policy; the policy could simply be that “we [the District] are going to follow the RSA.” She wanted to note that any child could become upset and end up being restrained, not just students with IEPs.
Concord resident and parent Kimberly Wood commented that both her children have disabilities. She asked whether CPI training includes knowing how to move a student safely, especially bigger students, as students may not always be in a classroom. She urged the Board to look for the happy medium. She said she has not received any written reports for restraint or seclusion. She agreed that more staff, services, training and a social-emotional curriculum are needed. She asked whether trauma-based training includes PTSD. She asked whether the district see spikes in restraint and seclusion data relative to times of year.

Concord resident Dan Habib commented on the definition of seclusion in the policy, specifically, that reference to a locked door should be removed, as it created the implication that being alone in a room with the door unlocked, does not count as seclusion. He also asked whether, if all other children are removed, the child remaining in the classroom is now in seclusion. He wondered whether there seclusion rooms at each school, or only in some.

Mr. Habib suggested that data should not only be collected but should be published showing distribution of restraint and seclusion by different ages, schools, and populations. He asked whether reporting IPCs differs from school to school. He said that the policy should ban prone restraint. He said parents should be called on their cell phone, not just the brief effort of calling a home number and not following up. Parents should be called by the end of the school day, not the end of the business day. He asked whether the restraint reports were broken down by IEPs, 504s, behavioral or emotional plans as well as the other variables. He asked whether a debriefing is also mandated for students without IEPs or 504 plans. He asked whether expulsion or suspensions or expulsion might be used instead of seclusion or restraint, creating a masking effect. He suggested discussing system issues to discover the underlying causes and roots of challenging behavior in the District. He suggested effective communication supports for every student in the district and the implementation of District-wide multi-tiered system of supports. He referenced concerns about several recommendations from the letter presented to the Board by Mike Macri, such as bringing in more police officers. He said the 3R programs should not be expanded. He suggested supporting support staff, using preventive as opposed to responsive approaches. He said it was good to note that that have been no seclusions or restraints at the high school, but that sometimes instead, high school students show self-harm behaviors and other challenges.

Jorges Santana, executive director of PACE Academy, said his charter school was servicing nine students from Concord, with four more coming in on Monday. He wanted the committee to think about how to make sure charter schools give the District information, and vice versa.

Concord parent Adrienne Evans suggested developing a process for students transitioning to charter schools from the District. Regarding the restraint and seclusion policy, she also said staff should have a good understanding about District expectations, consistency in reporting, and consequences for not reporting.
Ms. Aiken asked about the follow-up on review of the special education manual. Ms. Palley said the committee had decided at its last meeting to use the period of time during the Board’s budget preparation for parents to review the manual. This will take place beginning in February; the manual review would not be brought back to the Committee until April or May. Ms. Patterson noted that a number of student-safety related policies would also follow this schedule.

A motion was made to adjourn.

   Committee members voted 4-0 to adjourn (motioned by Mr. Croteau, seconded by Mr. Crush).

The meeting adjourned at 7:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jennifer Patterson, Chair
Linden Jackett, Recorder
Date: January 27, 2020

Committee members present: Barb Higgins, Chair; Danielle Smith, David Parker

Committee member absent: Gina Cannon

Administration: Interim Superintendent Frank Bass, Assistant Superintendent Donna Palley

Committee Chair Barb Higgins called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m.

The Committee voted 3-0 by roll call to go into non-public session on grounds of RSA 91-A:3 II (c) that states, in part: "... Matters which, if discussed in public, would likely affect adversely the reputation of any person ..." (motioned by David Parker, seconded by Danielle Smith).

The following topics were discussed:

Sabbatical applications for academic year 2020-2021.

The Committee voted 3-0 by roll call to recommend to the full Board that it consider one of the sabbatical applicants for a sabbatical for academic year 2020-2021 (motioned by Mr. Parker, seconded by Ms. Smith).

Ms. Smith made a motion to come out of non-public session.

The Committee voted 3-0 by roll call to come out of non-public session at 7:20 pm. (motioned by Ms. Higgins, seconded by Ms. Smith).

Ms. Higgins made a motion to adjourn.

The Committee voted 3-0 to adjourn (motioned by Ms. Higgins, seconded by Mr. Parker).

The meeting adjourned at 7:22 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Barb Higgins, Chair
Concord School District Policy #214 *

Acceptance of Gifts

Concord School District may accept gifts that are consistent with the mission, vision and goals of the District.

A gift is defined as money, supplies, equipment, real or personal property or personal services, provided without consideration.

The District is under no obligation to accept any gift. Gifts may be refused for any reason. Individuals, organizations or groups should be encouraged to discuss the gift or solicitation of gifts in advance with the building Principal or Superintendent or designee.

The Superintendent or designee may accept any gift to the District or individual school or department having a value of less than $5,000. Any gift to the District having a value of $5,000 or greater may only be accepted by the School Board. Any gift of real property (land, either developed or undeveloped, and/or buildings) may only be accepted by the Board. Gifts in the amount of $5,000 or more shall be noted in the agenda of the next regularly scheduled Board meeting and will include notice in the minutes of the meeting in which the gift is discussed. The acceptance of all gifts will be made in public session.

The Board, the Superintendent, or their designee shall not authorize gifts that are inappropriate, unsafe, or carry obligations or conditions that are out of proportion to the gift.

The District shall not discriminate in the acceptance and administration of gifts, bequests, scholarships and other aids, benefits, or services to students from private agencies, organizations or persons on the basis of gender, race, religion, national origin, sexual orientation, or disability.

* Also Policy #831
Corresponds to NHSBA Policy KCD
## Enrollment Report February 2020

### Elementary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abbot-Downing School</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaver Meadow School</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broken Ground School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christa McAuliffe School</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>64</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mill Brook School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>525</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Middle

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rundlett</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHS</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concord</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deerfield</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>341</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Preschool

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Number of children</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BMS</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mill Brook</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Placement</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Totals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Totals</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>278</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>274</td>
<td>304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>290</td>
<td>293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1728</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### District Total

<p>| |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4165</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(grades 4/5 combined)
## Monthly Enrollment Report Summary
### 2019-2020 School Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abbot-Downing</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>346</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaver Meadow</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>307</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broken Ground</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>344</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christa McAuliffe</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>396</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mill Brook</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>335</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Elementary</strong></td>
<td><strong>1758</strong></td>
<td><strong>1737</strong></td>
<td><strong>1735</strong></td>
<td><strong>1736</strong></td>
<td><strong>1728</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMS</td>
<td>949</td>
<td>949</td>
<td>952</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>950</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total RMS</strong></td>
<td><strong>949</strong></td>
<td><strong>949</strong></td>
<td><strong>952</strong></td>
<td><strong>950</strong></td>
<td><strong>950</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHS</td>
<td>1362</td>
<td>1350</td>
<td>1331</td>
<td>1326</td>
<td>1322</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deerfield</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>165</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total CHS</strong></td>
<td><strong>1530</strong></td>
<td><strong>1519</strong></td>
<td><strong>1497</strong></td>
<td><strong>1492</strong></td>
<td><strong>1487</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total K - 12</strong></td>
<td><strong>4237</strong></td>
<td><strong>4205</strong></td>
<td><strong>4184</strong></td>
<td><strong>4178</strong></td>
<td><strong>4165</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preschool</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaver Meadow</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mill Brook</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Placement</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Preschool</strong></td>
<td><strong>133</strong></td>
<td><strong>134</strong></td>
<td><strong>135</strong></td>
<td><strong>136</strong></td>
<td><strong>144</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Proposed Schedule of FY21 and Superintendent Search Activities
#### February through April 2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WS#</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>FY21</th>
<th>TIME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*</td>
<td>February 3 (Mon)</td>
<td>Monthly Board Meeting</td>
<td>7:00pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>February 4 (Tue)</td>
<td>Focus Group</td>
<td>details on website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>February 5 (Wed)</td>
<td>Focus Group</td>
<td>details on website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>February 6 (Thu)</td>
<td>Focus Groups (inclement weather)</td>
<td>details on website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>February 10 (Mon)</td>
<td>Opening Presentation &amp; Capital Facilities/DS</td>
<td>5:30 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>February 13 (Thu)</td>
<td>Salaries &amp; Benefits</td>
<td>5:30 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>February 17 (Mon)</td>
<td>Student Services</td>
<td>5:30 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>February 20 (Thu)</strong></td>
<td>Board Screening Profile – Supt. search</td>
<td><strong>5:30–7:00 pm</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>March 2 (Mon)</td>
<td>Curriculum &amp; Technology (Monthly Board meeting @ 7 pm)</td>
<td>5:30 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>March 4 (Wed)</strong></td>
<td>Screening Committee – training</td>
<td><strong>5:30–7:30pm</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>March 5 (Thu)</td>
<td>Open Session - Budget to POST (5 votes required)</td>
<td>5:30 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>March 9 (Mon)</td>
<td>Open Session</td>
<td>5:30 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>March 10 (Tues)</strong></td>
<td>Screening Committee – application review</td>
<td><strong>5:30–8:30pm</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>March 12 (Thu)</td>
<td>CHS and CRTC Enrollments</td>
<td>5:30 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>March 16 (Mon)</td>
<td>Public Hearing – Mill Brook</td>
<td>5:30 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>March 19 (Thu)</td>
<td>Public Hearing – Rundlett</td>
<td>7:00 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>March 23 (Mon)</td>
<td>Open Session</td>
<td>5:30 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>March 26 (Thu)</td>
<td>Open Session – finalize FY21 budget (5 votes required)</td>
<td>5:30 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>March 26 (Thu)</strong></td>
<td>Board – announce Superintendent finalists (tentative)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Week of March 30</strong></td>
<td>Board - Superintendent finalists' visits and interviews (tentative)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>April 6 (Mon)</strong></td>
<td>Board – monthly Board meeting - Superintendent finalist chosen (tentative)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### February 2020 Board Meetings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sun</th>
<th>Mon</th>
<th>Tue</th>
<th>Wed</th>
<th>Thu</th>
<th>Fri</th>
<th>Sat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **February 20 20 Board Meetings**

  - **Sun, Mon, Tue, Wed, Thu, Fri, Sat**

  - **February 2 2020**
    - **7:00 p.m.**
      - School Board meeting

  - **February 9 2020**
    - **5:30 p.m.**
      - Special Board meeting
        - Opening budget presentation; capital facilities; debt service

  - **February 13 2020**
    - **5:30 p.m.**
      - Board Work Session on the budget
      - Salaries; benefits

  - **February 16 2020**
    - **5:00 p.m.**
      - Executive
    - **5:30 p.m.**
      - Special Board meeting
        - Superintendent screening profile

  - **Winter Recess**
    - NO SCHOOL
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sun</th>
<th>Mon</th>
<th>Tue</th>
<th>Wed</th>
<th>Thu</th>
<th>Fri</th>
<th>Sat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5:30 p.m. Board Work Session on the budget Curriculum &amp; technology 7:00 p.m. School Board meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5:30 p.m. Board Work Session on the budget</td>
<td>Open topics Vote on budget to post</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5:30 p.m. Board Work Session on the budget Open topics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5:30 p.m. Board Work Session on the budget CHS and CRTC enrollments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:00 p.m. Executive 5:30 p.m. Public Hearing on the budget Mill Brook</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7:00 p.m. Public Hearing on the budget Rundlett Middle School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:30 p.m. Board Work Session on the budget Open topics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5:30 p.m. Board Work Session Finalize FY21 budget Announce Superintendent finalists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### April 2020 Board Meetings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sun</th>
<th>Mon</th>
<th>Tue</th>
<th>Wed</th>
<th>Thu</th>
<th>Fri</th>
<th>Sat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:00 p.m.</td>
<td>School Board meeting</td>
<td>Superintendent finalist chosen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Executive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Spring Recess**
- **NO SCHOOL**