

**Souhegan Cooperative School District
Thursday, May 5th 2011**

Call to order

Chairman Janson called the meeting to order at 5:08PM.

Non-Public Session

Steve made a motion to enter non-public session, under RSA 91-A:3 II (c), to discuss student scholarship awards. Motion seconded by Fran. Approved by roll call vote: Grondstra: Yes, Ludt: Yes, Coughlan: Yes, Janson: Yes, Harrow: Yes, Brown: Yes.

Mary Lou Mullens arrived at 5:15 pm.

Motion To Exit Non Public Session:

Steve made a motion to exit non public session. Motion seconded by Fran. Unanimously accepted by roll call vote: Coughlan: Yes, Grondstra: Yes, Janson: Yes, Ludt: Yes, Mullens: Yes, Brown: Yes. Non public session ended at 5:40 pm.

Attendance

Present

Chairman Chris Janson, Steve Coughlan, Mary Lou Mullens, Jeanne Ludt, Howard Brown, Fran Harrow, and Pim Grondstra.

Administrative Team

Jon Ingram, Mary Jennings, Ren a Sparks, Elizabeth Shankel, Nicole Heimarck, Gigi Klippa, Colleen Meany, Bob Thompson

Community Council

Scott Doyle

Minutes Taker

Beth Penney

Call to Order

Call to Order

Ms. Janson called the meeting to order at 6:03pm.

Announcements

Announcements

Principal's Report

46 Mr. Ingram discussed the accomplishments of the robotics team, Olivia Vordenberg
47 at the National Poetry Contest and student athletes that have been honored. He
48 noted important dates the board is invited to.

49
50 Mr. Ingram stated that they have begun to meet with students to get feedback about
51 the entry plan.

52
53 Ms. Harrow asked for a list of dates and times for Sr. Project presentations.

54
55 Mr. Ingram stated he would get the board that in the next few days.

56
57 Mr. Ingram stated that the 24th of May was a good day for the board to meet with
58 staff after school.

59
60 Mr. Ingram and the board discussed the best date for the school and the board.

61
62 Dr. Jennings stated that the SAU received notification that the state accepted the
63 number of days and hours for the school year and the last day of school will be June
64 24th.

65
66 Community Council Report

67
68 Alexander Kempf, Jacob Rettig, Scott Doyle gave a presentation from the community
69 council. (Bobby Graham was also involved in creating the presentation, but was not
70 at the meeting)

71
72 The presentation was about the reasons for removing the decile ranking system at
73 SHS. 318 students and 23 faculty members signed a petition supporting this change.
74 The presentation discussed the pros and cons to weighting GPAs and showed
75 evidence that a ranking system is not need when entering college. The students
76 called and spoke with many colleges and the message was the same. Colleges look
77 at students holistically and not having a rank will not put a student at a
78 disadvantage.

79
80 Karen Chininis, the director of guidance, was in attendance to help answer
81 questions.

82
83 Mr. Coughlan asked where is the community council in this process?

84
85 Alex Kempf stated that the council was holding another forum on May 16th from
86 6pm-7pm in community council room because only 10-15 parents attended the first
87 forum.

88
89 The board and Ms. Chininis discussed the impact on the administration. There
90 would be no impact because it is just math and they are finding more high schools
91 are moving away from the ranking system.

92
93 Mr. Ingram stated that at first he did not support the proposal, but the students have
94 done some great research and have changed his mind.

95
96 The board thanked the students for their hard work and in depth research.

97
98 Committee Reports

99
100 No reports.

101
102 **Public Time**

Public Time

103
104 No public present.

Consent Agenda

105
106 **Consent Agenda**

107
108 **Mr. Coughlan made a motion to accept the Consent Agenda containing the**
109 **March 23rd and April 7th minutes, the treasure's report, the Unanticipated**
110 **Revenue and the renewal rates. Ms. Ludt seconded the**
111 **motion and the vote was unanimous.**

Presentations and Reports

112 **Presentations/ Reports**

113
114 Facilities Plan

115
116 Dr. Jennings reminded the board that if this proposal meets their approval the SAU
117 is looking for a vote tonight to move forward.

118
119 Danielle Collins and Jim Miner gave the presentation.

120
121 Mr. Miner stated that this proposal is to improve efficiency of the cafeteria and to
122 address the annex cafeteria. The proposal also addresses other issues discussed in
123 the Gale report. The proposal includes the following:

- 124
125 1) Relocation of the Annex Cafeteria to the Sunroom in main building
126 2) Annex Cafeteria would become Art, this is from the Gale report
127 3) Wellness and the weight room would move into the art room
128 4) Old weight room would become an occupational therapy area

129
130 Ms. Collins discussed the changes and how this would be beneficial to the food
131 service. She discussed alterations to the sunroom and the movement of the vending
132 machines.

133
134 Mr. Miner discussed the layout of the cafeteria.

135
136 Mr. Brown asked where the vending machines would go?

137

138 Ms. Collins stated there are many option including the entrance of the main building
139 toward the annex, concessions storage in cafeteria, and the hallway.

140
141 Mr. Miner and Ms. Collins discussed the conversion of the sunroom using a map
142 showing the total seating as 244 including the main cafeteria.

143
144 The board discussed if there were any fire code issues, the transition for students,
145 and having options in the Annex for students who did not have time to come over to
146 the main building for lunch. There are no fire code issues and the food service is
147 looking at “Smart Vending” options for the Annex. The board discussed where those
148 machines would be located and where students could eat in the Annex. The board
149 discussed double lunches with less seating. The new flow and more options will
150 make the lines move faster for students. The board discussed a need to look at
151 changing the schedule to have three lunches so fewer students are eating at one
152 time.

153
154 Mr. Miner explained the other relocations and the cost associated with those
155 changes.

156
157 The board discussed electrical needs for the wellness room. They also discussed if
158 this proposal was in line with the Gale Report, which it is, but will cost a lot less than
159 what was estimated in the report. The costs do not include new fitness equipment,
160 but Mr. Miner indicated that the funding would come from else where and
161 donations.

162
163 The board discussed the reasons why this proposal is needed, but also to make a
164 commitment to ensure that looking at the schedule is done soon. They also
165 discussed the need to find places for students to eat in the Annex.

166
167 Ms. Shankel stated that they are committed to getting vending in the Annex by the
168 beginning of next year and that the administration will work on finding a space
169 where students can eat.

170
171 **Mr. Brown made a motion to give authority to Mr. Miner to move forward with**
172 **this proposal. Mr. Coughlan seconded the motion.**

173
174 Mr. Grondstra and Ms. Mullens stated they would like to see the schedule and
175 seating in the Annex conversations and proposals happen sooner and in parallel
176 with these changes to the cafeteria.

177
178 Mr. Ingram stated that there is a task force looking at scheduling this summer and
179 plan to have proposal for the board by October or November.

180
181 **The vote was unanimous.**

182
183 10Y Team: Report on Alt. Assessment

184

185 Mr. Ingram reminded the board that this is preliminary data and that the teachers
186 and students need to close out a full year and have time to reflect. The teachers will
187 come back and discuss their reflection at a later time.

188

189 Ms. Klippa reviewed the Academic Learning Expectations (ALE) and the grading
190 change. She discussed student and parent data. Ms. Klippa showed the board how
191 students are graded on each of the ALE and how students receive a lot of narrative
192 feedback. She stated that students have opportunity to revise work based on where
193 they make mistakes. The feedback from students is that they love the revision
194 process to improve grades and can produce higher quality product. Ms. Klippa
195 discussed motivation and achievement in students from the book Drive by Daniel
196 Pink. This new grading system shifts students experience to start understanding
197 that they can improve and is not defined by being an "A-" student or a "C" student.
198 Having learning goals prove students can apply knowledge to new circumstances
199 more successfully. Student's focus is on learning apposed to outcome.

200

201 Ms. Klippa discussed student feedback from a survey given. A majority of students
202 agree or strongly agree to most of the survey. She also discussed parent feedback
203 even though there was not a lot of response from parents, 9 total. More parents
204 disagree because this new grading system is challenging for parents to understand
205 because they are use to the old system.

206

207 The board discussed how to better translate and communicate this new grading
208 system with parents. They also discussed how to help parents use the feedback to
209 help their kids improve. Ms. Klippa told the board about how parents were walked
210 through each of the ALE and the new grading process during parent conferences.
211 The board discussed if this type of grading favors a certain type of student. Ms.
212 Klippa indicated that early data show that it does not, because team 10Y has the
213 least amount of no credits. The board also discussed the impact on teacher's time.

214

215 Ms. Harrow asked if there is a way to get a larger parent response because this is
216 only 11% of the parents.

217

218 Ms. Meany stated that all parents are in for Division I and this is an in person
219 opportunity to get feedback.

220

221 Ms. Mullens asked what the plan is from here.

222

223 Ms Klippa stated that 9th and 10th and others are already grading on ALE. 10Y
224 offered to pilot this grading system to access advantages and disadvantages.

225

226 Mr. Ingram stated a task force would look at this grading system this summer. The
227 ultimate objective is to have consistency and look at how to move forward. It takes
228 time for the education piece for students and parents; also to get professional
229 development for teachers.

230
231 Cindy Raspiller, a 10Y parent, stated she has mixed feelings about this grading
232 system. Her student was on edge, but now loves it. She finds this encouraging. She
233 stated that in life we get assessed in different ways. Her student is learning a lot
234 about how learn, but then at the end the feedback is turned into a letter grade. She
235 stated that she feels kids are trapped in an experiment and hopes this will not effect
236 him negatively from a college standpoint, but he has benefited greatly in many ways.
237
238 Dr. Jennings stated that Mont Vernon has changed their grading system to give
239 students more feedback.
240
241 Ms. Klippa stated high schools need to help higher education move forward because
242 they are the ones holding the paradigm shift back.
243
244 NECAP Analysis/ AYP Status
245
246 Dr. Jennings reminded the board that they already were shown the NECAP scores
247 and that this presentation is what we are doing with them now including
248 assessment of curriculum and students and looking at AYP for sub groups.
249
250 Ms. Meany reviewed each area Reading, Writing, and Math performance since 2007
251 which showed increasing trends. She discussed SHS compared to the state, looked
252 at gap analysis btw Non-IEP and IEP students and gender, and reviewed area and
253 district comparison.
254
255 Ms. Harrow asked if the test could access the functional literacy of IEP students.
256
257 Ms. Meany stated that the state has looked into this and is looking at different
258 questions and getting ideas from Australian Schools, which are more progressive.
259
260 Ms. Harrow asked is there a comparison of NECAP scores and grades.
261
262 Ms. Heimarck discussed the limitations of this test and that there is no perfect
263 solution. She stated that this test is not an accurate measure of strong verse weak
264 school or schools in need of improvement because of this sub group with an IEP and
265 schools are seeing this at a state level and a national level.
266
267 Ms. Meany discussed the work with staff that was done to look at trends and create
268 action.
269
270 Mr. Brown asked about if the Math scores were shared with Professor Sherma.
271
272 Ms. Heimarck stated that he has reviewed some of the information, but not the
273 scores from this year.
274

275 The board discussed whether SHS Math curriculum is aligned with the testing time.
276 They also discussed whether teachers will answer the questions they came up with
277 when looking at the test scores. The teachers will work on answering their
278 questions with in each department. They also talked about students having more
279 opportunities for VLACS and how to let more students know about those
280 opportunities.

281
282 Dr. Jennings, Ms. Klippa, and the board discussed the fact SHS did not make AYP in
283 the Special Education sub group because SHS did not have 40 special education
284 students in the 11th grade, so data from last year was used. The board discussed the
285 implications of this for next year and the potential to become a SINY school because
286 of a numbers game. The board discussed the chance to appeal to the state again and
287 why the SAU decided not to make an appeal this year.

288
289 Mr. Coughlan stated that the board and administration should celebrate the overall
290 school performance and that they need to be sensitive to the sub group because it is
291 a failure of the system.

292
293 Ms. Harrow stated that there are limitations to the assessment and she gave
294 examples of how the test is limiting. She stated this is difficult because this is
295 a state and federal program. Students need to be looked as a whole and not
296 just based on this assessment.

Discussion

297
298 **Discussion**

299
300 **Policy JJE – Fundraising Activities – 2nd Reading**

301
302
303 Mr. Brown stated that the committee changed the statement that discusses funds
304 raised in one year should be used in that year.

305
306 Ms. Harrow stated that one exception maybe for trips that happen every other year
307 like Disney and asked can there be exceptions.

308
309 The board discussed the words “should” vs “must” or having the principal make
310 exceptions. The board decided the current wording was fine.

311
312 **School Board Scholarship Committee Process**

313
314 Ms. Janson stated that she added this to the agenda because of questions that came
315 up. She stated that the board needed to formalize the process more.

316
317 The board discussed how much money is in the fund for the scholarship and how it
318 has been awarded in the past. They also discussed what the rule was for each
319 scholarship and how to award Amherst and Mont Vernon scholarships.

320

321 Mr. Brown stated that he will look into getting clarification about how the Mont
322 Vernon scholarship has been awarded.

323
324 The board discussed awarding the scholarships to include both Amherst and Mont
325 Vernon and how they may not be able to change that based on the founding
326 documents for the scholarships.

327
328 Ms. Janson will look into finding the records of the original documents or old
329 minutes. She will also contact the trustees of the trust fund.

330
331 **Mr. Grondstra made a motion to go into Non-Public session under RSA 91-A:3**
332 **II.(a). Ms. Harrow seconded the motion and all board members roll called yes**
333 **at 8:26pm.**

334
335 **Non-Public Session**

336 **Item #1**

337 At 8:35 pm Mary Lou made a motion to reseal the March 23, 2011 Non Public
338 minutes for an indefinite time period. Fran seconded the motion. Motion passed
339 unanimously.

340 **Item #2**

341 Fran made a motion to have Dr. Jennings propose, without precedence, to Gary that
342 in order for him to be released from his obligations:

343 1) He would not collect his accrued sick leave reparations of approximately
344 \$12,000.

345 2) He would forego his first year of retirement pay (\$5000) and second year of
346 retirement pay (\$8,500).

347 Pim seconded the motion. Mary Lou, Pim, Fran, Jeanne, Howard voted in favor of
348 the motion and Steve and Chris voted not in favor. (5-2-0)

349 **Item #3**

350 Dr. Jennings requested that the board increase the new proposed base salary for the
351 Athletic Director. The current salary is \$68,290 and the proposed salary would be
352 \$77,000. Mr. Ingram stated that he thought \$77, 000 would not entice the proven
353 top athletic directors to apply but would ensure some very good candidates would
354 put in their resumes. The board was in favor of the increase.

355 **Item #4**

356 Fran made a motion to allow Dr. Jennings to increase Bob Thompson's salary from
357 \$77,112 to \$81,000. Mary Lou seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous to
358 increase the salary. (7-0-0)

359 **Item #5**

360 Dr. Jennings requested the board's input and started a conversation to elicit
361 response for Principal Jon Ingram's evaluation.

362

363 **Motion To Exit Non-Public Session:**

364

365 Fran made a motion to exit non public session. Motion seconded by Chris.
366 Unanimously accepted by roll call vote: Coughlan: yes, Grondstra: yes, Janson: yes,
367 Ludt: yes, Mullens: yes, Brown: yes.

368

369 **The Board re-entered public session at 10:18 PM**

370

371 **Motion To Adjourn**

372

373 Chris made a motion to adjourn the meeting. The motion was seconded by Jeanne.

374 Motion passed unanimously. Meeting adjourned at 10:20 pm.

375

376