



SCHOOL ADMINISTRATIVE UNIT #51

23 Oneida Street, Unit 1
Pittsfield, New Hampshire 03263
Phone: (603) 435-5526 • Fax (603) 435-5331
Bryan Lane – Superintendent of Schools

PITTSFIELD SCHOOL BOARD

MEETING AGENDA

5:30 PM Thursday, May 19, 2022

PMHS Media Center

Pittsfield Middle High School

Join with Google Meet: meet.google.com/ekb-odkn-dej

1. CALL TO ORDER
2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE
3. ACTION ON AMENDED AGENDA
4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM May 5, 2022
5. PUBLIC INPUT
6. STUDENT REPRESENTATIVE

7. DIRECTOR OF STUDENT SERVICES

Information & Discussion

Action Items

| | |
|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • District Determinations • Preschool Screenings | |
|---|--|

8. SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS

Information & Discussion

Action Items

| | |
|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staffing & Contracts • Footwork Fridays • Bid Status • Heating • Team Harriman Design – Feasibility Study | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Drake Field Use Request – Pittsfield PTO Sensory Run |
|---|--|

9. SCHOOL BOARD

Information & Discussion

Action Items

| | |
|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy Review – First Reading: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ DRF, District Reserve Fund Administration ○ DIE, Audits ○ DGA, Authorized Signatures ○ EDC, Authorized Use of School-Owned Materials and Equipment | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teacher Nominations • Policy Review – Second Reading: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ CHCA, Approval of Handbooks and Directives ○ ILBA, Assessment of Educational Programs ○ JG, Assignment of Students to Classes and Grade Levels ○ JH, Attendance, Absenteeism, and Truancy |
|---|--|

10. COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS

BUDGET COMMITTEE -
DRAKE FIELD & FACILITIES -
NEGOTIATIONS –
FOSS FAMILY SCHOLARSHIP – Sarah Duval

11. PLAN AGENDA FOR NEXT MEETING

12. PUBLIC INPUT

13. NON-PUBLIC SESSION - RSA 91-A 3 (a) the dismissal, promotion, or compensation of the disciplining of such employee, or the investigation of any charges against him or her, unless the employee affected (1) has a right to a meeting and (2) requests that the meeting be open, in which the request shall be granted. (b)The hiring of any public employee. (c) Matters which, if discussed in public, would likely affect the reputation of any person, other than a member of the public body itself, unless such person requests an open meeting. This exemption shall extend to any application for assistance or tax abatement or a waiver of a fee, fine, or other levy, if based on inability to pay or poverty of the applicant. - Negotiations

14. ADJOURNMENT

**STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
SCHOOL ADMINISTRATIVE UNIT #51
PITTSFIELD SCHOOL BOARD**

MINUTES

Pittsfield School Board Meeting
May 5, 2022
Pittsfield Middle High School

I. CALL TO ORDER

Members Present: Adam Gauthier, Chairperson
Sandra Adams, Vice Chairperson
Susan Duval
Molly Goggin

Others Present: Bryan Lane, Interim Superintendent
Melissa Brown, Assistant Principal, PMHS
Derek Hamilton, Principal, PMHS
Mike Wiley, Principal, PES
Members of the Public

Chairman Gauthier opened the meeting at 5:30 p.m.

II. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The pledge of allegiance was led by Mr. Gauthier.

III. AGENDA REVIEW

The following items were added:

- Celebration for Retirees (Ms. Adams)
- Student Centered Learning (Ms. Goggin)
- Teacher Appreciation Week (Mr. Gauthier)
- Drake Field (Ms. Duval)
- PES PTO (Ms. Duval)
- Book Challenge (Mr. Wiley)
- Drake Field Facility Request (Mr. Hamilton)

IV. ACTION ON AMENDED AGENDA

On a motion made by Ms. Adams and seconded by Ms. Goggin, the Board unanimously approved the amended agenda.

V. APPROVAL OF PREVIOUS MEETING MINUTES

The minutes of the April 21, 2022 meeting were considered. On page three, paragraph one, omit the second period at the end of the sentence; on page five, paragraph four, change to "...student centered learning would be helpful."; and on page five, paragraph six, change Chassis to Chassie. On a motion made by Ms. Duval and seconded by Ms. Adams, the minutes were unanimously approved as amended.

VI. PUBLIC INPUT - None

VII. STUDENT REPRESENTATIVE

Matthew Swenson stated that the Advisory Council was present at Site Council to ask to work on the Advisory Handbook. The Site Council has submitted a proposal to the School Board relative to the dress code. Discussion ensued regarding the changes that are being proposed by the Site Council. On a motion made by Ms. Duval and seconded by Ms. Goggin, the Board approved the proposal as presented with Ms. Adams, Ms. Duval, and Ms. Goggin voting in the affirmative and Mr. Gauthier voting in opposition.

Mr. Hamilton agreed to put the changes into effect as of Monday, May 16, 2022.

VIII. PES PRINCIPAL

A. Lego Robotics

Mr. Wiley reported that Kathy Mahanes attended the Christa McAuliffe Technology conference and attended a Lego Robotics Session. She returned excited about the possibility of bringing Lego Robotics to the district. Rustic Crust has agreed to be a local supporter, which is a requirement of the NH Department of Education. Mr. Wiley provided details about the grant that will support the effort. The Lego League Night has been scheduled for June 15, 2022.

B. Professional Development

Mr. Wiley stated that PES teachers are formatting the curriculum to be displayed on the district website. Also, a book group is occurring, using a book titled, How to Prevent Reading Difficulties.

C. Security Assessment

According to Mr. Wiley, the NH Department of Homeland Security visited PES on April 19, 2022 to conduct a security assessment. A report will be forthcoming.

D. Book Challenge

Mr. Wiley explained a book challenge that is happening at PES. The goal is to have the student body read 3,000 books.

E. Calendar of Events

Mr. Wiley provided the Board with a list of upcoming events

IX. PMHS PRINCIPAL

A. Drake Field

Mr. Hamilton announced that a processional parade sponsored by the Catholic Church will be moving through Drake Field on May 25 through May 27, 2022.

On a motion made by Mr. Gauthier and seconded by Ms. Goggin, the Board voted unanimously to approve the use of Drake Field for the Catholic Church.

Mr. Hamilton stated that the Joy Church has requested the use of Drake Field on August 13, 2022. On a motion made by Mr. Gauthier and seconded by Ms. Goggin, the Board voted unanimously to approve the use of the field.

B. Calendar of Event

Mr. Hamilton provided the Board with a calendar of upcoming events.

C. Empty Bowls Event

On Thursday, May 19, 2022, the Empty Bowls Event will be held prior to the Board meeting. Mr. Hamilton thanked Rustic Crust and Hannaford Supermarket of Northwood for their support.

D. Exhibition of Learning

According to Mr. Hamilton, the 2022 Exhibition Night is being prepared. Students are being provided assistance in developing the presentation of one piece of work.

E. Middle School After School Program

Mr. Hamilton explained that a middle school after school program will be offered on Tuesdays and Thursdays from 3:00 to 4:00. Students can drop in for academic support in their core courses. The program will run through June 16, 2020.

F. National Honor Society Induction Ceremony

Mr. Hamilton stated that the National Honor Society Induction Ceremony was held on April 6, 2022. Riley Nagle, Trevor Mills, and Jadin Weygand were

inducted. The National Honor Society continues to run the school-based food pantry, which is open to the student body on Fridays at 2:00.

G. Project Soapbox

According to Mr. Hamilton, senior Lilli Brisbois will be representing PMHS at the NH Project Soapbox Showcase on Thursday, May 12, 2022. Mr. LaRoche, social studies teacher, has been instrumental in growing and enhancing this program at PMHS and throughout the State.

H. Summer Programs

The extended school year program will run Monday through Thursday from July 11 to August 4, 2022. Two programs will be offered.

Responding to a question raised by Ms. Goggin, Mr. Wiley stated that there are no summer Title I programs being planned. However, Mr. Lane stated that he is investigating options for summer programs for elementary students.

I. Vision of the Learner Forum

The District Leadership Team and the PMHS Vision of the Learner Focus Group is preparing for the next community forum on Saturday, May 14, 2022 from 10:00 to 12:00 in the PMHS media center. Participants will be invited to rotate through stations to offer feedback. Mr. Hamilton highlighted that the vision is relative to the entire student body, grades K through 12. For people unable to attend, there will be an online option for providing feedback. Also, there will be an opportunity at Exhibition Night.

IX. INTERIM SUPERINTENDENT

A. Contracts

Mr. Lane stated that contracts have been distributed. As of Monday, May 2, 2022, there are eleven people who have indicated that they will not be returning. Mr. Lane is finalizing a questionnaire to be completed by these people in order to learn why they might be leaving. Mr. Lane's goal is to be fully staffed by June 15, 2022.

Administration, support staff, and paraprofessional contracts are in process.

B. After School Program

Mr. Lane stated that he is working with Victoria Marcotte to investigate the implementation of an after school program beginning in the fall.

C. Drake Field

Mr. Lane reported that he has further inspected Drake Field. He is getting quotes for removal and installation of new asphalt, repairing the natural path that leads to the water, trimming the pathway, and replenishing the crushed stone.

D. Bids

Bids for paper, field maintenance, and the dumpsters will be available to the Board at the May 19, 2022 meeting.

E. School Board Vacancy

Mr. Lane stated that the written questions developed by the Board for the two candidates for School Board appointment were sent. The responses were returned and shared with the Board members prior to the meeting.

F. Facilities Staff

Mr. Lane thanked the facilities staff, who have stripped and waxed the floors in the SAU during the vacation break.

X. SCHOOL BOARD

A. Policies - First Reading

The following policies were presented for the first reading:

- Policy CHCA, Approval of Handbooks and Directives
- Policy ILBA, Assessment of Educational Programs
- Policy JG, Assignment of Students to Classes and Grade Levels
- Policy JH, Attendance, Absenteeism, and Truancy

B. Policies - Second Reading

The following policies were presented for the second reading and approval:

- Policy IMBC, Alternative Credit Options - On a motion made by Ms. Adams and seconded by Ms. Duval, the Board voted unanimously to change Director of College and Career Readiness to Principal or designee in Policy IMBC.
- Policy IHBI, Alternative Learning Plans - On a motion made by Mr. Gauthier and seconded by Ms. Adams, the Board voted unanimously to approve Policy IHBI with change of Director of College and Career Readiness to Principal or designee and to change Board to School Board.
- Policy IL, Analysis and Assessment of Instructional Resources - approved as written.

- Policy DB, Annual Budget - On a motion made by Mr. Gauthier and seconded by Ms. Duval, the Board voted unanimously to approve Policy DB with a change from Board to School Board.

C. Retiree Celebration

Ms. Adams asked if arrangements are in process for the celebration of retirees. Mr. Lane stated that the administrative assistant has this task on her list of things to do. Mr. Lane agreed to reach out to the PMHS staff to see if students might take on the responsibility of creating the invitations for the retirees and their families.

Mr. Gauthier asked Mr. Wiley if he would arrange to have elementary students make cards for the retirees, since many of them would have had these teachers. Mr. Lane also suggested asking the senior class for cards.

Ms. Adams suggested buying a gift from a local artist for the retirees.

D. Student Centered Learning

Ms. Goggin stated her desire to begin a conversation with the Board on student centered learning. She suggested improving communication about the efforts that continue to promote student centered learning by assessing the current status. Ms. Goggin also expressed interest in measuring the benefits of student centered learning. She is concerned that people may be misinformed about what student centered learning is and what it looks like in Pittsfield.

Ms. Adams stated that there is a lot of misunderstanding about student centered learning in the community. She stated that the Board needs to have answers in order to answer the questions that may be coming up in the community.

E. Teacher Appreciation Week

Ms. Duval publicly recognized the PES PTO's effort to celebrate teachers at PES. She said that what they did to show their appreciation of the teachers was extraordinary.

Ms. Goggin asked if the PTO was limited to PES. Mr. Lane explained that historically PTOs are more active at the elementary level.

Mr. Hamilton stated that similar acknowledgements have occurred at PMHS, sponsored by the administration.

F. Drake Field

Ms. Duval stated her continued concern about the behavior at Drake Field. Mr. Gauthier relayed an incident in which he was recently a part. Mr. Lane stated that it is appropriate to call the Pittsfield Police Department if problems are

encountered while at Drake Field. Discussion ensued regarding strategies that could be considered to limit issues at Drake Field.

XI. COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS

- A. Budget Committee Representative
- B. Drake Field and Facilities
- C. Negotiating Team
- D. Foss Family Scholarship

On a motion made by Mr. Gauthier and seconded by Ms. Adams, the Board voted unanimously to appoint Ms. Duval as the School Board representative to the Foss Family Scholarship Committee.

XII. NEXT MEETING

The next meeting of the Board is scheduled for Thursday, May 19, 2022 at 5:30 p.m. in the Pittsfield Middle High School Media Center.

XIII. PUBLIC INPUT

Diane Rider asked if the discussion about curriculum will continue at the Board level. Mr. Gauthier said it would be on the agenda.

Ms. Rider stated that a charter school called Franklin Academy is in progress to be opened in Pittsfield. She provided the Board with some background information. Ms. Rider suggested bringing someone to the Board to provide information. She suggested visiting their website at www.franklinacademy.info. Mr. Lane invited a person from Franklin Academy to request being added to the agenda for an upcoming Board meeting.

Clayton Wood opined that the Board needs to do something to control behavior at Drake Field. He suggested getting some professional help to figure out what steps could be taken.

Ms. Rider suggested a “See Something - Say Something” initiative be used to help control the situation at Drake Field.

Mr. Wood suggested developing a leadership position to assist in controlling the Drake Field situation.

Louie Houle relayed an incident in which he was involved at Drake Field, underscoring the problem of behavior. He stated that something needs to be done to enforce rules.

Mr. Wood suggested that the problem is that no one takes ownership or authority over Drake Field. He stated that he doesn't think an appropriate alternative is to hire district personnel to deal with the issue. He does feel strongly that something has to be done to address the issue.

Mr. Houle suggested inviting the Select Board and Police Department to have a conversation about the problems at Drake Field. Mr. Wood suggested appointing one of the Board members to talk to the Select Board. Mr. Lane stated that he will invite Chief Collins to attend a future meeting to continue the discussion.

Ms. Rider asked if there were consequences for the student involved in the breaking of the lobby window, to which Mr. Hamilton replied in the affirmative.

XIV. NON-PUBLIC

At 7:20 p.m. a motion was made by Mr. Gauthier and seconded by Ms. Adams to enter into a non-public session under the authority of RSA 91-A:3 (a) to discuss personnel. The Board was polled and voted unanimously to enter into a non-public session (Ms. Adams, yes; Ms. Duval, yes; Mr. Gauthier, yes; Ms. Goggin, yes).

At ___ p.m. a motion was made by ___ and seconded by ___ to exit from a non-public session. The Board was polled and voted unanimously to exit the non-public session (Ms. Adams, yes; Ms. Duval, yes; Mr. Gauthier, yes; Ms. Goggin, yes).

XV. ADJOURNMENT

A motion was made by ___ and seconded by ___ to adjourn the meeting. The Board voted unanimously to adjourn the meeting at ___ p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Tobi Gray Chassie
Recording Secretary

PITTSFIELD SCHOOL BOARD

Non-Public Session Minutes

May 5, 2022

Members Present: Adam Gauthier, Chairperson
Sandra Adams, Vice Chairperson
Sarah Duval
Molly Goggin

Motion: On a motion by Mr. Gauthier and seconded by Ms. Adams, the Board voted unanimously to enter into a non-public session under the authority of RSA 91-A:3 II (c).

Specific Statutory Reason for Nonpublic Session: RSA 91-A:3 II (a) to discuss personnel issues.

| | | |
|---|--------------|-----|
| <u>Roll call:</u> Vote to enter non-public session: | Ms. Adams | yes |
| | Ms. Duval | yes |
| | Mr. Gauthier | yes |
| | Ms. Goggin | yes |

Time Nonpublic Session Entered: 7:20 p.m.

Other Persons Present: Interim Superintendent Bryan Lane.

Description of Matters Discussed: Personnel Issue

Action: No Action

Public Session Reconvened: 8:25 p.m.

Motion to Adjourn: Mr. Gauthier, seconded by Ms. Goggin

Minutes Recorded by: Bryan Lane

Pittsfield School District

To: Pittsfield School Board
From: Jess Bickford
Subject: Board Meeting – May 19, 2022
Date: May 12, 2022

INFORMATION

1. District Determinations:

I have provided you with a packet of information regarding the special education indicators of success that are measured by the Department of Education. I previously let The Board know that the State was changing the way they measure school success. This is the first time school districts have been evaluated by risk level by indicators. The rubric attached gives a breakdown of Pittsfield's scores relative to risk. A score of zero is little to no risk and meets requirements, a score of one is slight risk and needs assistance, and a score of two is an indicator of greater risk and needs intervention. This document reviews the entire set of criteria and Pittsfield's performance and risk assessment. These data are relative to the 2020-2021 school year. In summary Pittsfield is classified as a district in need of assistance in the area of assessment for our students, particularly in the areas of performance and participation.

The Director of Student Services has already met with both of the building principals to share these results and start the conversation of trying to reduce the number of students that opt out of statewide assessments each year.

2. Preschool Screenings.

The pre-school screening is scheduled for Friday, May 20, 2022. The screening service as a dual purpose of fulfilling our special education child find obligations and finding typical age-mates for our students with special needs in our preschool program.

2021-2022 SPECIAL EDUCATION LEA DETERMINATIONS RUBRIC

| | | | |
|-------------|------------|-----------------------|------------------|
| LEA: | Pittsfield | Determination: | Needs Assistance |
|-------------|------------|-----------------------|------------------|

DETERMINATIONS MADE BASED ON INDIVIDUAL SECTION RESULTS AS DESCRIBED ON PAGE 2

SUMMARY

| 1. Results Based | |
|--|--------------------|
| Area | Score |
| A Indicator 1: Graduation | 2 |
| B Indicator 2: Drop Out | 2 |
| C.1 Indicator 5A: Ed Environments | 0 |
| C.2 Indicator 5B: Ed Environments | 0 |
| C.3 Indicator 5C: Ed Environments | 2 |
| D.1 Indicator 6A: Preschool Environments | 0 |
| D.2 Indicator 6B: Preschool Environments | 0 |
| E.1 Indicator 7A1: Preschool Outcomes | 0 |
| E.2 Indicator 7A2: Preschool Outcomes | 0 |
| E.3 Indicator 7B1: Preschool Outcomes | 0 |
| E.4 Indicator 7B2: Preschool Outcomes | 0 |
| E.5 Indicator 7C1: Preschool Outcomes | 0 |
| E.6 Indicator 7C2: Preschool Outcomes | 2 |
| F Indicator 8: Parent Involvement <i>(going forward)</i> | NA |
| G.1 Indicator 14A: Post-School Outcomes <i>(going forward)</i> | NA |
| G.2 Indicator 14B: Post-School Outcomes <i>(going forward)</i> | NA |
| G.3 Indicator 14C: Post-School Outcomes <i>(going forward)</i> | NA |
| Total Score: | 8/26 |
| Percent of Total: | 30.77% |
| Section Result: | Meets Requirements |
| 2. Assessment | |
| Area | Score |
| A.1 Indicator 3A: Reading Participation (4) | 2 |
| A.2 Indicator 3A: Reading Participation (8) | 2 |
| A.3 Indicator 3A: Reading Participation (11) | 2 |
| A.4 Indicator 3A: Math Participation (4) | 2 |
| A.5 Indicator 3A: Math Participation (8) | 2 |
| A.6 Indicator 3A: Math Participation (11) | 2 |
| B.1 Indicator 3B: Reading Proficiency (4) | 2 |
| B.2 Indicator 3B: Reading Proficiency (8) | 2 |
| B.3 Indicator 3B: Reading Proficiency (11) | 2 |
| B.4 Indicator 3B: Math Proficiency (4) | 2 |
| B.5 Indicator 3B: Math Proficiency (8) | 2 |
| B.6 Indicator 3B: Math Proficiency (11) | 2 |
| C.1 Indicator 3C: Alt Reading Proficiency (4) | 0 |
| C.2 Indicator 3C: Alt Reading Proficiency (8) | 2 |
| C.3 Indicator 3C: Alt Reading Proficiency (11) | NA |
| C.4 Indicator 3C: Alt Math Proficiency (4) | 2 |
| C.5 Indicator 3C: Alt Math Proficiency (8) | 2 |
| C.6 Indicator 3C: Alt Math Proficiency (11) | NA |
| D.1 Indicator 3D: Gap Reading Proficiency (4) | 2 |

| D.2 Indicator 3D: Gap Reading Proficiency (8) | 0 |
|---|--------------------|
| D.3 Indicator 3D: Gap Reading Proficiency (11) | 2 |
| D.4 Indicator 3D: Gap Math Proficiency (4) | 0 |
| D.5 Indicator 3D: Gap Math Proficiency (8) | 0 |
| D.6 Indicator 3D: Gap Math Proficiency (11) | 2 |
| E Alt Assessment Participation (1%) | 2 |
| Total Score: | 38/46 |
| Percent of Total: | 82.61% |
| Section Result: | Needs Intervention |
| 3. Compliance | |
| Area | Score |
| A Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion | 0 |
| B Indicator 9: Disproportionate Rep. | 0 |
| C Indicator 10: Disproportionate Rep./Dis. | 0 |
| D Indicator 11: Child Find | 1 |
| E Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition | 0 |
| F Indicator 13: Secondary Transition <i>(going forward)</i> | NA |
| Total Score: | 1/10 |
| Percent of Total: | 10.00% |
| Section Result: | Meets Requirements |
| 4. Additional/Other Factors | |
| Area | Score |
| A Grants: FY22 Grant Submission | 0 |
| B Grants: 50% Allocated (Budgeted) by Jan 1st. | 0 |
| C Grants: Percent of Allocation Returned | 0 |
| D Grants: Reporting Monthly <i>(going forward)</i> | NA |
| E Last Monitored (CIM) | 1 |
| F Submission of CEIS Data | NA |
| G Substantiated Sp. Ed. Complaint Allegations | 0 |
| H SPED Admin Turnover <i>(going forward)</i> | NA |
| I Use of NHSEIS <i>(going forward)</i> | NA |
| Total Score: | 1/10 |
| Percent of Total: | 10.00% |
| Section Result: | Meets Requirements |

| Section Results Scale: | % of possible points |
|--------------------------------------|----------------------|
| Meets Requirements..... | 00.00% – 38.00% |
| Needs Assistance | 38.01% – 65.00% |
| Needs Intervention | 65.01% – 85.00% |
| Needs Substantial Intervention | 85.01% – 100.00% |

2021-2022 SPECIAL EDUCATION LEA DETERMINATIONS RUBRIC

LEA Determinations are based on individual section results using the following:

Step 1:

- Are there 2 or more section results of Needs Substantial Intervention?
 - Yes – LEA Determination of **Needs Substantial Intervention**
 - No – go to Step 2.

Step 2:

- Are there 2 or more section results of Needs Intervention or one section result of Needs Substantial Intervention?
 - Yes – LEA Determination of **Needs Intervention**
 - No – go to Step 3.

Step 3:

- Are there no section results of Needs Substantial Intervention and 2 or more section results of Needs Assistance or 1 section result of Needs Intervention?
 - Yes – LEA Determination of **Needs Assistance**
 - No – got to Step 4

Step 4:

- Are there 4 section results of Meets Requirements or 3 section results of Meets Requirements & 1 section result of Needs Assistance?
 - Yes – LEA Determination of **Meets Requirements**

2021-2022 SPECIAL EDUCATION LEA DETERMINATIONS RUBRIC

| 1. Results Based | | | | |
|--|--|--------------|----------|-----------|
| Data Point | Rubric | Target | LEA Data | LEA Score |
| A. Indicator 1: Graduation | <i>Met target..... 0 Points</i> <i>Did not meet target..... 2 Points</i> <i>Not Applicable..... NA</i> | > = 95% | 16.67 | 2 |
| Graduation: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating with regular high school diploma. State Data: 78.45% Target: <u>Greater than or equal to 95%</u> of youth with IEPs graduating (exiting) from high school with a regular high school diploma in school year 2020-2021 Data Source: Reported by the district through NHSEIS | | | | |
| B. Indicator 2: Dropout | <i>Met target..... 0 Points</i> <i>Did not meet target..... 2 Points</i> <i>Not Applicable..... NA</i> | < = 0.65% | 33.33 | 2 |
| Dropout: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school State Data: 9.54% Target: <u>Less than or equal to 0.65%</u> of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school in school year 2020-2021 Data Source: Reported by the district through NHSEIS | | | | |
| C.1. Indicator 5A: Ed Environments | <i>Met target..... 0 Points</i> <i>Did not meet target..... 2 Points</i> | > = 74% | 84.17 | 0 |
| Educational Environments: Percent of children with IEPs aged 5 who are in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day State Data: 73.75% Target: <u>Greater than or equal to 74%</u> of children with IEPs aged 5 who are in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day in school year 2020-2021 Data Source: Child Count and Environment – reported by the district through NHSEIS | | | | |

| Data Point | Rubric | Target | LEA Data | LEA Score |
|--|--|--------------|----------|-----------|
| C.2. Indicator 5B: Ed Environments | <i>Met target..... 0 Points</i> <i>Did not meet target..... 2 Points</i> | < = 7% | 2.50 | 0 |
| Educational Environments: Percent of children with IEPs aged 5 who are in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day State Data: 8.94% Target: <u>Less than or equal to 7%</u> of children with IEPs aged 5 who are in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day in school year 2020-2021 Data Source: Child Count and Environment – reported by the district through NHSEIS | | | | |
| C.3. Indicator 5C: Ed Environments | <i>Met target..... 0 Points</i> <i>Did not meet target..... 2 Points</i> | < = 2.05% | 5.00 | 2 |
| Educational Environments: Percent of children with IEPs aged 5 who are in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements State Data: 2.46% Target: <u>Less than or equal to 2.05%</u> of children with IEPs aged 5 who are in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements in school year 2020-2021 Data Source: Child Count and Environment – reported by the district through NHSEIS | | | | |
| D.1. Indicator 6A: Preschool Environments | <i>Met target..... 0 Points</i> <i>Did not meet target..... 2 Points</i> <i>Not Applicable..... NA</i> | > = 60% | 75.00 | 0 |
| Preschool Environments: Percent of children with IEPs aged 3, 4, and 5 who are enrolled in a preschool program attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program State Data: 41.51% Target: <u>Greater than or equal to 60%</u> of children with IEPs aged 3, 4, and 5 who are enrolled in a preschool program attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program in school year 2020-2021 Data Source: Child Count and Environment – reported by the district through NHSEIS | | | | |

| Data Point | Rubric | Target | LEA Data | LEA Score |
|---|--|------------|----------|-----------|
| D.2. Indicator 6B: Preschool Environments | <i>Met target..... 0 Points</i> <i>Did not meet target..... 2 Points</i> <i>Not Applicable..... NA</i> | < = 12% | 0.00 | 0 |
| Preschool Environments: Percent of children with IEPs aged 3, 4, and 5 who are enrolled in a preschool program attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility State Data: 12.48% Target: <u>Less than or equal to 12%</u> of children with IEPs aged 3, 4, and 5 who are enrolled in a preschool program attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility in school year 2020-2021 Data Source: Child Count and Environment – reported by the district through NHSEIS | | | | |
| E.1. Indicator 7A1: Preschool Outcomes | <i>Met target..... 0 Points</i> <i>Did not meet target..... 2 Points</i> <i>Not Applicable..... NA</i> | > = 80% | 90.00 | 0 |
| Preschool Outcomes: Preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) – of those preschool children who entered the preschool program below age expectations in each outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. State Data: 75.05% Target: <u>Greater than or equal to 80%</u> of those preschool children who entered the preschool program below age expectations in each outcome substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program in school year 2020-2021 Data Source: Reported by district through AEPS (Assessment, Evaluation, & Programming System) or TS Gold (Teaching Strategies) | | | | |
| E.2. Indicator 7A2: Preschool Outcomes | <i>Met target..... 0 Points</i> <i>Did not meet target..... 2 Points</i> <i>Not Applicable..... NA</i> | > = 62% | 70.00 | 0 |
| Preschool Outcomes: Preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) – the percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in each outcome by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program State Data: 53.15% Target: <u>Greater than or equal to 62%</u> of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in each outcome by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program in school year 2020-2021 Data Source: Reported by district through AEPS (Assessment, Evaluation, & Programming System) or TS Gold (Teaching Strategies) | | | | |

| Data Point | Rubric | Target | LEA Data | LEA Score |
|--|--|--------------|----------|-----------|
| E.3. Indicator 7B1: Preschool Outcomes | <i>Met target..... 0 Points</i> <i>Did not meet target..... 2 Points</i> <i>Not Applicable..... NA</i> | > = 80% | 90.00 | 0 |
| <p>Preschool Outcomes: Preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy) – of those preschool children who entered the preschool program below age expectations in each outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.</p> <p>State Data: 75.34%</p> <p>Target: <u>Greater than or equal to 80%</u> of those preschool children who entered the preschool program below age expectations in each outcome substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program in school year 2020-2021</p> <p>Data Source: Reported by district through AEPS (Assessment, Evaluation, & Programming System) or TS Gold (Teaching Strategies)</p> | | | | |
| E.4. Indicator 7B2: Preschool Outcomes | <i>Met target..... 0 Points</i> <i>Did not meet target..... 2 Points</i> <i>Not Applicable..... NA</i> | > = 61.5% | 70.00 | 0 |
| <p>Preschool Outcomes: Preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy)</p> <p>State Data: 51.63%</p> <p>Target: <u>Greater than or equal to 61.50%</u> of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in each outcome by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program in school year 2020-2021</p> <p>Data Source: Reported by district through AEPS (Assessment, Evaluation, & Programming System) or TS Gold (Teaching Strategies)</p> | | | | |
| E.5. Indicator 7C1: Preschool Outcomes | <i>Met target..... 0 Points</i> <i>Did not meet target..... 2 Points</i> <i>Not Applicable..... NA</i> | > = 77.5% | 100.00 | 0 |
| <p>Preschool Outcomes: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs – of those preschool children who entered the preschool program below age expectations in each outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.</p> <p>State Data: 76.26%</p> <p>Target: <u>Greater than or equal to 77.50%</u> of those preschool children who entered the preschool program below age expectations in each outcome substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program in school year 2020-2021</p> <p>Data Source: Reported by district through AEPS (Assessment, Evaluation, & Programming System) or TS Gold (Teaching Strategies)</p> | | | | |

| Data Point | Rubric | Target | LEA Data | LEA Score |
|---|--|--------------|----------|-----------|
| E.6. Indicator 7C2: Preschool Outcomes | <i>Met target..... 0 Points</i> <i>Did not meet target..... 2 Points</i> <i>Not Applicable..... NA</i> | > = 63.5% | 40.00 | 2 |
| <p>Preschool Outcomes: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs – the percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in each outcome by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program</p> <p>State Data: 49.88%</p> <p>Target: <u>Greater than or equal to 63.50%</u> of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in each outcome by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program in school year 2020-2021</p> <p>Data Source: Reported by district through AEPS (Assessment, Evaluation, & Programming System) or TS Gold (Teaching Strategies)</p> | | | | |
| F. Indicator 8: Parent Involvement (going forward) | <i>Met target..... 0 Points</i> <i>Did not meet target..... 2 Points</i> <i>NR: No Responses..... 1 Point</i> | NA | NA | NA |
| <p>Parent Involvement: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities</p> <p>State Data: 51.92%</p> <p>Target: <u>Greater than or equal to 39%</u> of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities in school year 2020-2021</p> <p>Data Source: Parent Involvement Survey</p> | | | | |
| G.1. Indicator 14A: Post School Outcomes (going forward) | <i>Met target..... 0 Points</i> <i>Did not meet target..... 2 Points</i> <i>NR: No Responses..... 1 Point</i> <i>Not Applicable..... NA</i> | NA | NA | NA |
| <p>Post School Outcomes: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school</p> <p>State Data: 45.45%</p> <p>Target: <u>Greater than or equal to 45.5%</u> of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school from school year 2019-2020</p> <p>Data Source: Exiting Report – reported by district through NHSEIS, Surveys – districts send to students who are one year post exit from school</p> | | | | |

| Data Point | Rubric | Target | LEA Data | LEA Score |
|---|--|--------|----------|-----------|
| G.2. Indicator 14B: Post School Outcomes (going forward) | <i>Met target..... 0 Points</i> <i>Did not meet target..... 2 Points</i> <i>NR: No Responses..... 1 Point</i> <i>Not Applicable..... NA</i> | NA | NA | NA |
| Post School Outcomes: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school State Data: 80.30% Target: <u>Greater than or equal to 80.3%</u> of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school from school year 2019-2020 Data Source: Exiting Report – reported by district through NHSEIS, Surveys – districts send to students who are one year post exit from school | | | | |
| G.3 Indicator 14C: Post School Outcomes (going forward) | <i>Met target..... 0 Points</i> <i>Did not meet target..... 2 Points</i> <i>NR: No Responses..... 1 Point</i> <i>Not Applicable..... NA</i> | NA | NA | NA |
| Post School Outcomes: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school State Data: 93.94% Target: <u>Greater than or equal to 93.94%</u> of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school from school year 2019-2020 Data Source: Exiting Report – reported by district through NHSEIS, Surveys – districts send to students who are one year post exit from school | | | | |

2021-2022 SPECIAL EDUCATION LEA DETERMINATIONS RUBRIC

2. Assessment

Data Source: Assessment data sent to NHDOE

SAT Proficiency: Students scoring at Achievement Levels 3 and 4

Alt Assessment Proficiency: Students scoring At Target or Advanced

| Data Point | Rubric | Target | LEA Data | LEA Score |
|---|---|------------|----------|-----------|
| A.1 Indicator 3A: Statewide Assessment – Reading Participation Grade 4 | <i>Met target..... 0 Points</i> <i>Did not meet target..... 2 Points</i> | > = 95% | 75.00 | 2 |
| Reading Participation Grade 4: Assessment participation rate for children with IEPs in grade 4 State Data: 77.44% Target: <u>Greater than or equal to 95%</u> overall reading assessment participation rate for children with IEPs in school year 2020-2021 | | | | |
| A.2 Indicator 3A: Statewide Assessment – Reading Participation Grade 8 | <i>Met target..... 0 Points</i> <i>Did not meet target..... 2 Points</i> | > = 95% | 69.23 | 2 |
| Reading Participation Grade 8: Assessment participation rate for children with IEPs in grade 8 State Data: 66.97% Target: <u>Greater than or equal to 95%</u> overall reading assessment participation rate for children with IEPs in school year 2020-2021 | | | | |
| A.3 Indicator 3A: Statewide Assessment – Reading Participation Grade 11 | <i>Met target..... 0 Points</i> <i>Did not meet target..... 2 Points</i> | > = 95% | 25.00 | 2 |
| Reading Participation Grade 11: Assessment participation rate for children with IEPs in grade 11 State Data: 56.98% Target: <u>Greater than or equal to 95%</u> overall reading assessment participation rate for children with IEPs in school year 2020-2021 | | | | |
| A.4 Indicator 3A: Statewide Assessment – Math Participation Grade 4 | <i>Met target..... 0 Points</i> <i>Did not meet target..... 2 Points</i> | > = 95% | 75.00 | 2 |
| Math Participation Grade 4: Assessment participation rate for children with IEPs in grade 4 State Data: 78.29% Target: <u>Greater than or equal to 95%</u> overall math assessment participation rate for children with IEPs in school year 2020-2021 | | | | |
| A.5 Indicator 3A: Statewide Assessment – Math Participation Grade 8 | <i>Met target..... 0 Points</i> <i>Did not meet target..... 2 Points</i> | > = 95% | 69.23 | 2 |
| Math Participation Grade 8: Assessment participation rate for children with IEPs in grade 8 State Data: 67.04% Target: <u>Greater than or equal to 95%</u> overall math assessment participation rate for children with IEPs in school year 2020-2021 | | | | |

| Data Point | Rubric | Target | LEA Data | LEA Score |
|--|---|---------------|----------|-----------|
| A.6 Indicator 3A: Statewide Assessment – Math Participation Grade 11 | Met target..... 0 Points Did not meet target..... 2 Points | > = 95% | 25.00 | 2 |
| Math Participation Grade 11: Assessment participation rate for children with IEPs in grade 11 State Data: 56.98% Target: <u>Greater than or equal to 95%</u> overall math assessment participation rate for children with IEPs in school year 2020-2021 | | | | |
| B.1. Indicator 3B: Statewide Assessment – Reading Proficiency Grade 4 | Met target..... 0 Points Did not meet target..... 2 Points Not Applicable..... NA | > = 14.68% | 0.00 | 2 |
| Reading Proficiency Grade 4: Reading proficiency rate for children with IEPs in grade 4 against grade level academic achievement standards State Data: 14.68% Target: <u>Greater than or equal to 14.68%</u> reading proficiency rate for children with IEPs in grade 4 against grade level academic achievement standards in school year 2020-2021 | | | | |
| B.2. Indicator 3B: Statewide Assessment – Reading Proficiency Grade 8 | Met target..... 0 Points Did not meet target..... 2 Points Not Applicable..... NA | > = 10.04% | 0.00 | 2 |
| Reading Proficiency Grade 8: Reading proficiency rate for children with IEPs in grade 8 against grade level academic achievement standards State Data: 10.04% Target: <u>Greater than or equal to 10.04%</u> reading proficiency rate for children with IEPs in grade 8 against grade level academic achievement standards in school year 2020-2021 | | | | |
| B.3. Indicator 3B: Statewide Assessment – Reading Proficiency Grade 11 | Met target..... 0 Points Did not meet target..... 2 Points Not Applicable..... NA | > = 20.46% | 0.00 | 2 |
| Reading Proficiency Grade 11: Reading proficiency rate for children with IEPs in grade 11 against grade level academic achievement standards State Data: 20.46% Target: <u>Greater than or equal to 20.46%</u> reading proficiency rate for children with IEPs in grade 11 against grade level academic achievement standards in school year 2020-2021 | | | | |
| B.4. Indicator 3B: Statewide Assessment – Math Proficiency Grade 4 | Met target..... 0 Points Did not meet target..... 2 Points Not Applicable..... NA | > = 15.76% | 0.00 | 2 |
| Math Proficiency Grade 4: Math proficiency rate for children with IEPs in grade 4 against grade level academic achievement standards State Data: 15.76% Target: <u>Greater than or equal to 15.76%</u> math proficiency rate for children with IEPs in grade 4 against grade level academic achievement standards in school year 2020-2021 | | | | |

| Data Point | Rubric | Target | LEA Data | LEA Score |
|---|---|---------------|----------|-----------|
| B.5. Indicator 3B: Statewide Assessment – Math Proficiency Grade 8 | Met target..... 0 Points Did not meet target..... 2 Points Not Applicable..... NA | > = 6.2% | 0.00 | 2 |
| Math Proficiency Grade 8: Math proficiency rate for children with IEPs in grade 8 against grade level academic achievement standards State Data: 6.20% Target: <u>Greater than or equal to 6.2%</u> math proficiency rate for children with IEPs in grade 8 against grade level academic achievement standards in school year 2020-2021 | | | | |
| B.6. Indicator 3B: Statewide Assessment – Math Proficiency Grade 11 | Met target..... 0 Points Did not meet target..... 2 Points Not Applicable..... NA | > = 7.47% | 0.00 | 2 |
| Math Proficiency Grade 11: Math proficiency rate for children with IEPs in grade 11 against grade level academic achievement standards State Data: 7.47% Target: <u>Greater than or equal to 7.47%</u> math proficiency rate for children with IEPs in grade 11 against grade level academic achievement standards in school year 2020-2021 | | | | |
| C.1. Indicator 3C: Statewide Assessment – Reading Proficiency Alt Assessment Grade 4 | Met target..... 0 Points Did not meet target..... 2 Points Not Applicable..... NA | > = 33.53% | 100.00 | 0 |
| Reading Proficiency Alt Assessment Grade 4: Reading proficiency rate for children with IEPs in grade 4 against alternate academic achievement standards State Data: 28.71% Target: <u>Greater than or equal to 33.53%</u> reading proficiency rate for children with IEPs in grade 4 against alternate academic achievement standards in school year 2020-2021 | | | | |
| C.2. Indicator 3C: Statewide Assessment – Reading Proficiency Alt Assessment Grade 8 | Met target..... 0 Points Did not meet target..... 2 Points Not Applicable..... NA | > = 33.53% | 0.00 | 2 |
| Reading Proficiency Alt Assessment Grade 8: Reading proficiency rate for children with IEPs in grade 8 against alternate academic achievement standards State Data: 40.79% Target: <u>Greater than or equal to 33.53%</u> reading proficiency rate for children with IEPs in grade 8 against alternate academic achievement standards in school year 2020-2021 | | | | |
| C.3. Indicator 3C: Statewide Assessment – Reading Proficiency Alt Assessment Grade 11 | Met target..... 0 Points Did not meet target..... 2 Points Not Applicable..... NA | > = 33.53% | NA | NA |
| Reading Proficiency Alt Assessment Grade 11: Reading proficiency rate for children with IEPs in grade 11 against alternate academic achievement standards State Data: 31.08% Target: <u>Greater than or equal to 33.53%</u> reading proficiency rate for children with IEPs in grade 11 against alternate academic achievement standards in school year 2020-2021 | | | | |

| Data Point | Rubric | Target | LEA Data | LEA Score |
|--|--|--------------|----------|-----------|
| C.4. Indicator 3C: Statewide Assessment – Math Proficiency Alt Assessment Grade 4 | <i>Met target..... 0 Points</i> <i>Did not meet target..... 2 Points</i> <i>Not Applicable..... NA</i> | > = 49% | 0.00 | 2 |
| Math Proficiency Alt Assessment Grade 4: Math proficiency rate for children with IEPs in grade 4 against alternate academic achievement standards State Data: 49.00% Target: <u>Greater than or equal to 49%</u> math proficiency rate for children with IEPs in grade 4 against alternate academic achievement standards in school year 2020-2021 | | | | |
| C.5. Indicator 3C: Statewide Assessment – Math Proficiency Alt Assessment Grade 8 | <i>Met target..... 0 Points</i> <i>Did not meet target..... 2 Points</i> <i>Not Applicable..... NA</i> | > = 15.8% | 0.00 | 2 |
| Math Proficiency Alt Assessment Grade 8: Math proficiency rate for children with IEPs in grade 8 against alternate academic achievement standards State Data: 15.79% Target: <u>Greater than or equal to 15.8%</u> math proficiency rate for children with IEPs in grade 8 against alternate academic achievement standards in school year 2020-2021 | | | | |
| C.6. Indicator 3C: Statewide Assessment – Math Proficiency Alt Assessment Grade 11 | <i>Met target..... 0 Points</i> <i>Did not meet target..... 2 Points</i> <i>Not Applicable..... NA</i> | > = 29.7% | NA | NA |
| Math Proficiency Alt Assessment Grade 11: Math proficiency rate for children with IEPs in grade 11 against alternate academic achievement standards State Data: 29.73% Target: <u>Greater than or equal to 29.7%</u> math proficiency rate for children with IEPs in grade 11 against alternate academic achievement standards in school year 2020-2021 | | | | |
| D.1. Indicator 3D: Statewide Assessment – Gap in Reading Proficiency Grade 4 | <i>Met target..... 0 Points</i> <i>Did not meet target..... 2 Points</i> <i>Not Applicable..... NA</i> | < = 38.4% | 39.39 | 2 |
| Gap in Reading Proficiency Grade 4: Gap in reading proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students in grade 4 against grade level academic achievement standards State Data: 34.19% Target: <u>Less than or equal to 38.4%</u> gap in reading proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students in grade 4 against grade level academic achievement standards in school year 2020-2021 | | | | |
| D.2. Indicator 3D: Statewide Assessment – Gap in Reading Proficiency Grade 8 | <i>Met target..... 0 Points</i> <i>Did not meet target..... 2 Points</i> <i>Not Applicable..... NA</i> | < = 38% | 31.71 | 0 |
| Gap in Reading Proficiency Grade 8: Gap in reading proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students in grade 8 against grade level academic achievement standards State Data: 39.13% Target: <u>Less than or equal to 38%</u> gap in reading proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students in grade 8 against grade level academic achievement standards in school year 2020-2021 | | | | |

| Data Point | Rubric | Target | LEA Data | LEA Score |
|---|---|--------------|----------|-----------|
| D.3. Indicator 3D: Statewide Assessment – Gap in Reading Proficiency Grade 11 | <i>Met target..... 0 Points</i> <i>Did not meet target..... 2 Points</i> <i>Not Applicable..... NA</i> | < = 42.7% | 47.37 | 2 |
| Gap in Reading Proficiency Grade 11: Gap in reading proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students in grade 11 against grade level academic achievement standards State Data: 43.13% Target: <u>Less than or equal to 42.7%</u> gap in reading proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students in grade 11 against grade level academic achievement standards in school year 2020-2021 | | | | |
| D.4. Indicator 3D: Statewide Assessment – Gap in Math Proficiency Grade 4 | <i>Met target..... 0 Points</i> <i>Did not meet target..... 2 Points</i> <i>Not Applicable..... NA</i> | < = 33.9% | 20.59 | 0 |
| Gap in Math Proficiency Grade 4: Gap in math proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students in grade 4 against grade level academic achievement standards State Data: 25.64% Target: <u>Less than or equal to 33.9%</u> gap in math proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students in grade 4 against grade level academic achievement standards in school year 2020-2021 | | | | |
| D.5. Indicator 3D: Statewide Assessment – Gap in Math Proficiency Grade 8 | <i>Met target..... 0 Points</i> <i>Did not meet target..... 2 Points</i> <i>Not Applicable..... NA</i> | < = 34% | 9.52 | 0 |
| Gap in Math Proficiency Grade 8: Gap in math proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students in grade 8 against grade level academic achievement standards State Data: 26.69% Target: <u>Less than or equal to 34%</u> gap in math proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students in grade 8 against grade level academic achievement standards in school year 2020-2021 | | | | |
| D.6. Indicator 3D: Statewide Assessment – Gap in Math Proficiency Grade 11 | <i>Met target..... 0 Points</i> <i>Did not meet target..... 2 Points</i> <i>Not Applicable..... NA</i> | < = 34.8% | 36.84 | 2 |
| Gap in Math Proficiency Grade 11: Gap in math proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students in grade 11 against grade level academic achievement standards State Data: 34.95% Target: <u>Less than or equal to 34.8%</u> gap in math proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students in grade 11 against grade level academic achievement standards in school year 2020-2021 | | | | |
| E Percent of Students with IEPs taking the Alternate Assessment [1 %] | <i>Less than 1% 0 Points</i> <i>1% to 1.99% 1 Point</i> <i>2% or Greater 2 Points</i> | < 1% | 2.03 | 2 |
| ESEA section 1111(b)(2)(D)(i)(I) limits the total number of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities who are assessed Statewide with an AA-AAAS to 1.0 percent of the total number of students in the State who are assessed in that subject. State Data: 0.83% | | | | |

2021-2022 SPECIAL EDUCATION LEA DETERMINATIONS RUBRIC

| 3. Compliance *NA – LEA data on rubric reflects trend data, not the district’s annual data for this indicator, which is not comparable at the state level so state level data and targets are not included here. | | | | |
|--|---|--------|----------|-----------|
| Data Point | Rubric | Target | LEA Data | LEA Score |
| A. Indicator 4B: Suspension Based on Race | <i>No years 0 Points</i> <i>1 year..... 1 Point</i> <i>2 or more years 2 Points</i> | *NA | 0 yrs | 0 |
| Suspension: LEAs that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, by race or ethnicity, in the rate or suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs and policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards Rubric: Number of years of noncompliance with the requirements of Indicator 4b within the past five years Data Source: Discipline Report – reported by the district through NHSEIS, Child Count and Environment – reported by the district through NHSEIS. | | | | |
| B. Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation in Special Education | <i>No years 0 Points</i> <i>1 year..... 1 Point</i> <i>2 or more years 2 Points</i> | *NA | 0 yrs | 0 |
| Disproportionate Representation: LEAs with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification Rubric: Number of years of noncompliance with the requirements of Indicator 9 within the past five years Data Source: Child Count and Environment – reported by the district through NHSEIS, Fall District Enrollment – reported by the district. | | | | |
| C. Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories | <i>No years 0 Points</i> <i>1 year..... 1 Point</i> <i>2 or more years 2 Points</i> | *NA | 0 yrs | 0 |
| Disproportionate Representation: LEAs with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification Rubric: Number of years of noncompliance with the requirements of Indicator 10 within the past five years Data Source: Child Count and Environment – reported by the district through NHSEIS, Fall District Enrollment – reported by the district. | | | | |
| D. Indicator 11: Child Find | <i>No years 0 Points</i> <i>1 year..... 1 Point</i> <i>2 or more years 2 Points</i> | *NA | 1 yrs | 1 |
| Child Find: Children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe Rubric: Number of years of noncompliance with the requirements of Indicator 10 within the past five years Data Source: Ind. 11 – Timeliness of Initial Evaluations – Reported by the district through NHSEIS and desk audit. | | | | |

| Data Point | Rubric | Target | LEA Data | LEA Score |
|---|--|--------|----------|-----------|
| E. Indicator 12: Part C to B Transition | <i>No years 0 Points</i> <i>1 year..... 1 Point</i> <i>2 or more years 2 Points</i> | *NA | 0 yrs | 0 |
| Part C to B Transition: Children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays Rubric: Number of years of noncompliance with the requirements of Indicator 12 within the past five years Data Source: Ind. 12 – Early Childhood Transitions – reported by the district through NHSEIS and desk audit. | | | | |
| F. Indicator 13: Secondary Transition (going forward) | <i>Met target..... 0 Points</i> <i>Did not meet target..... 2 Points</i> <i>Not Applicable..... NA</i> | 100% | NA | NA |
| Secondary Transition: Percent of youth ages 16 and above with annually updated measurable postsecondary goals based upon a transition assessment, including courses of study, transition services, and annual goals related to transition needs. Also evidence the student was invited to the IEP meeting, and if appropriate, permission to invite and involve outside agencies who may be responsible for transition service(s). State Data: 64.29% Rubric: Met 100% Target Data Source: State review of District files. | | | | |

2021-2022 SPECIAL EDUCATION LEA DETERMINATIONS RUBRIC

| 4. Additional/Other Factors | | | |
|--|---|------------|-----------|
| Data Point | Rubric | LEA Data | LEA Score |
| A. Grants: IDEA/Preschool Submission of Grant Funds | <i>On or before 9/1/21..... 0 Points</i> <i>Between 9/1 & 9/30..... 1 Point</i> <i>After 9/30/21..... 2 Points</i> | 7/8/2021 | 0 |
| FY 22 (2021-2022) Grant First Submitted by District through the Grants Management System (GMS) for review | | | |
| Data Source: District initial submission for IDEA/Preschool funds in GMS | | | |
| B. Grants: 50% Allocated (Budgeted) by Jan 1st. | <i>50% or more Allocated 0 Points</i> <i>0.01% - 49.99% Allocated. 1 Point</i> <i>0.00% Allocated 2 Points</i> | 72.33 | 0 |
| Percent allocated (budgeted) of the total (IDEA and Preschool) 2021-2022 Grant | | | |
| Data Source: District allocation of IDEA/Preschool funds in GMS | | | |
| C. Grants: Percent of Allocation Returned as of Nov. 15th | <i>0%-4.99% Returned 0 Points</i> <i>5%-9.99% Returned 1 Point</i> <i>10% or greater Returned... 2 Points</i> | 2.51 | 0 |
| Total (IDEA and Preschool) 2019-2020 Grant, Percent returned November 2021. | | | |
| Data Source: District reimbursement of IDEA/Preschool funds in GMS | | | |
| D. Grants: Is the District reporting monthly expenses in IDEA Grants (going forward) | <i>SCALE TBD 0 Points</i> <i>SCALE TBD 1 Point</i> <i>SCALE TBD 2 Points</i> | NA | NA |
| Full year of reporting monthly (Sept – July) from previous year (going forward) | | | |
| Data Source: District reporting of IDEA/Preschool funds in GMS | | | |
| E. Years since last monitored through the CIM process | <i>2017 to present..... 0 Points</i> <i>2015 or prior 1 Point</i> <i>NULL: Never monitored.... 2 Points</i> | 2013 | 1 |
| How many years since the district was last monitored through the Compliance & Improvement Monitoring Process. | | | |
| Data Source: Bureau of Special Education Support historical records | | | |
| F. Submission of CEIS Data | <i>Yes 0 Points</i> <i>No 2 Points</i> <i>Not Applicable..... NA</i> | NA | NA |
| For Districts using CEIS Funds; was the collection of CEIS reporting timely and accurate for FY21 | | | |
| Data Source: CEIS Activities – entered by districts in GMS, CEIS Reporting Spreadsheet – submitted by districts to Bureau | | | |
| G. Special Education Complaints – Substantiated Allegations | <i>Less than 2 over 2 or more years 0 Points</i> <i>2-4 over 2 or more years 1 Point</i> <i>5 or more over 2 or more years 2 Points</i> | 0 SA/0 yrs | 0 |
| Number of substantiated allegations within the past three years | | | |
| Data Source: NHDOE Office of Governance records | | | |

| Data Point | Rubric | LEA Data | LEA Score |
|---|---|----------|-----------|
| H. Special Education Administrator Turnover (going forward) | <i>No turnover 0 Points</i> <i>SCALE..... 1 Points</i> <i>SCALE..... 2 Points</i> | NA | NA |
| Has there been turnover in the Special Education Administrator (not building coordinators, or building directors)? (Going forward) | | | |
| I. Use of the New Hampshire Special Education Information System (NHSEIS) (going forward) | <i>Yes 0 Points</i> <i>No 2 Points</i> | NA | NA |
| Does the district use EasyIEP in NHSEIS? (going forward) | | | |

| IDENTIFICATION | Hispanic/ Latino | | | | American Indian or Alaska Native | | | | Asian | | | | Black or African American | | | | Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Isl. | | | | White | | | | Two or More Races | | |
|-------------------------------|---------------------|-------|-------|--|----------------------------------|-------|-------|--|---------------------|-------|-------|--|---------------------------|-------|-------|--|---------------------------------------|-------|-------|--|---------------------|-------|-------|--|-------------------|-------|-------|
| | Risk Ratio* for SY: | | | | Risk Ratio* for SY: | | | | Risk Ratio* for SY: | | | | Risk Ratio* for SY: | | | | Risk Ratio* for SY: | | | | Risk Ratio* for SY: | | | | | | |
| Ages 3 – 21 | 19-20 | 20-21 | 21-22 | | 19-20 | 20-21 | 21-22 | | 19-20 | 20-21 | 21-22 | | 19-20 | 20-21 | 21-22 | | 19-20 | 20-21 | 21-22 | | 19-20 | 20-21 | 21-22 | | 19-20 | 20-21 | 21-22 |
| All Disabilities | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1.12 | 1.30 | 1.47 | | | | |
| Autism | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1.37 | 1.28 | 1.31 | | | | |
| Emotional Disturbance | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 2.40 | 2.49 | 2.18 | | | | |
| Intellectual Disability | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Other Health Impairment | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1.45 | 1.55 | 1.48 | | | | |
| Speech or Language Impairment | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 2.26 | 2.58 | 1.94 | | | | |
| Specific Learning Disability | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0.97 | 0.96 | 1.37 | | | | |

| PLACEMENT | Hispanic/ Latino | | | | American Indian or Alaska Native | | | | Asian | | | | Black or African American | | | | Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Isl. | | | | White | | | | Two or More Races | | |
|--------------------------------|---------------------|-------|-------|--|----------------------------------|-------|-------|--|---------------------|-------|-------|--|---------------------------|-------|-------|--|---------------------------------------|-------|-------|--|---------------------|-------|-------|--|-------------------|-------|-------|
| | Risk Ratio* for SY: | | | | Risk Ratio* for SY: | | | | Risk Ratio* for SY: | | | | Risk Ratio* for SY: | | | | Risk Ratio* for SY: | | | | Risk Ratio* for SY: | | | | | | |
| | 19-20 | 20-21 | 21-22 | | 19-20 | 20-21 | 21-22 | | 19-20 | 20-21 | 21-22 | | 19-20 | 20-21 | 21-22 | | 19-20 | 20-21 | 21-22 | | 19-20 | 20-21 | 21-22 | | 19-20 | 20-21 | 21-22 |
| Ages 6 – 21 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Reg. Class less than 40% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Separate School or Residential | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Blank Cells indicate target area did not meet the minimum cell and N size or no data was available.

***Alternate Risk Ratio** is used when comparison group did not meet cell or N size for the target area.

****Total Removals per Child Ratio** is used for Total Disciplinary Removals. **Alternate Total Removals per Child** is used when comparison group did not meet cell or N size for the target area.

Threshold for Disproportionality: Ratio greater than 3.50

Ratio greater than 3.50

Determination of Significant Disproportionality;

Ratio greater than 3.50 for 3 consecutive years with no reasonable progress

Pursuant to 34 CFR 300.646 and with stakeholder input, New Hampshire has established reasonable a threshold above which disproportionality is significant. The threshold is:

- A risk ratio, Total Removals Per Child (TRPC) ratio, or alternate risk or TRPC ratio where appropriate, of 3.50 or higher for three consecutive years in the same target group;
- Where no reasonable progress is shown.

The target group is the district specific area, sub-area and racial category being calculated. Reasonable progress in New Hampshire is defined as at least a 10% rate of decrease in risk or alternate risk ratio from year to year over the three years in the target group



SCHOOL ADMINISTRATIVE UNIT #51

23 Oneida Street, Unit 1

Pittsfield, New Hampshire 03263

Phone: (603) 435-5526 • Fax (603) 435-5331

Bryan Lane – Superintendent of Schools

SUPERINTENDENT'S REPORT

May 19, 2022

As of the writing of this report, the following positions are open for the 2022-23 school year:

| | |
|---------------|---|
| District Wide | Director of Student Support Services |
| PES | Kindergarten - nomination pending Music Special Education Grade level teacher Assistant Principal |
| PMHS | English 9/10- nomination pending Special Education- nomination pending Middle School Math |

There are currently two staff persons actively interviewing in other school districts that I am aware of.

Contracts for all position with the exception of para-educators have been distributed to the staff. Those contracts will go out prior to June 1.

The Footwork Fridays activity has been suspended until further notice so that we can work toward meeting the safety standard guidance suggested by PRIMEX, our insurance provider. We would need to have about 30 adults involved along with additional training for staff. Last week there were six adults involved in the supervision. We would also need to have specific permission forms for the activity which currently are covered under the “walking field trip” permission given at the beginning of the year.

Information on bids will be coming to the Board for Drake Field and Dumpsters at the meeting on May 19.

As the warm weather begins to move in, the circulating pumps for the heating systems in the buildings have been turned off during the day. This is a good cost savings move for the District. The boilers will be turned off on May 20.

I have reached out to Team Design Harriman for information on the feasibility study and gotten no response. I will continue to seek out information.



SCHOOL ADMINISTRATIVE UNIT #51

23 Oneida Street, Unit 1
Pittsfield, New Hampshire 03263
Phone: (603) 435-5526 • Fax (603) 435-5331
Bryan Lane – Superintendent of Schools

TO: The Pittsfield School Board
FROM: Bryan Lane
DATE: 5/16/22
RE: Bid for field maintenance at Drake Field.

The District received one bid for the field maintenance for Drake Field. The attached are the bid specifications and the information that was received from SummerScape for the services to be rendered in the amount of \$15,000.

I recommend a motion to award SummerScape the contract for field maintenance for Drake field in the amount of \$15,000.



SCHOOL ADMINISTRATIVE UNIT #51

23 Oneida Street, Unit 1
Pittsfield, New Hampshire 03263
Phone: (603) 435-5526 • Fax (603) 435-5331
Bryan Lane – Superintendent of Schools

The Pittsfield School District is requesting bids for the grounds maintenance of Drake Field for three (3) years with the following specifications:

Part One – Background and General Scope of Work

1. The Pittsfield School District seeks to engage the services of a qualified contractor to provide field and athletic turf maintenance services to include mowing, trimming, cleaning, aerating, irrigation maintenance and other services as specified for the School's Drake Field.
2. The School is responsible for providing high quality and responsive service to the students of the Pittsfield School District and the residents of Pittsfield.
3. The Pittsfield School District strives to provide the students and residents of Pittsfield with the highest quality athletic fields, recreational services and green space to enhance the life of our community. The Pittsfield Schools District manages Drake Field and its 11 acres. This field is home to several major events each year, home to our soccer and baseball facilities, and offer a variety of activities including tennis, basketball courts, a playground, fishing, and access to the Suncook River.

Part Two – Field Maintenance Detailed Scope of Work

Proposer should, at a minimum, address the Detailed Scope of Work as part of their proposal package. Proposers may add additional items that are considered necessary to implementing the requested services.

2.1 Turf Maintenance

- 2.1.1 Cut all lawn areas weekly. These areas include all area inside fence area as well as immediate areas outside the fenced areas. Includes entrances/exits on Barnstead Road side, Fayette Street side and Chestnut Street side of Drake Field.
- 2.1.2 During busy growth and events being held at Drake Field, mowing twice a week may be required.
- 2.1.3 Trimming all fenced areas including entrances/exits bi-weekly. To include trees, dugouts, grandstand, gazebo, sheds, walking trail, and any objects in field.
- 2.1.4 Grass clippings, branches, and debris must be removed from Drake Field premise after being cut or found on lawn areas.

2.2 Spring/Fall Cleanup and removal

- 2.2.1 Remove branches, leaves, stones, and all other debris twice a year during the Fall and Spring Season as directed by Athletic Director. To include removal of all waste to dump or other site.
- 2.2.2 Areas to include all lawn areas inside fence and the immediate area outside the fence. All the areas near the grandstand, shed, dugouts, tennis courts, and walking trail.



SCHOOL ADMINISTRATIVE UNIT #51

23 Oneida Street, Unit 1
Pittsfield, New Hampshire 03263
Phone: (603) 435-5526 • Fax (603) 435-5331
Bryan Lane – Superintendent of Schools

2.3 Aerating Turf

2.3.1 Perform aeration to the baseball and soccer fields and surrounding turf twice a year as directed by Athletic Director. Typically, will be done in the Spring and in fall. Irrigation system will need to be flagged and aeration done around sprinkler heads. Aeration holes should be spaced between 2-3 inches, which may require 2 or 3 passes with aerator

Bids should be submitted by Friday May 6, 2022.

Please send sealed bids to the address above, marked: "Drake Field Bid"

The Pittsfield School District reserves the right to reject any or all bids and to accept that bid which appears to be in the best interest of the District. The District reserves the right to waive any formalities in, or reject, any or all bids or any part of any bid. Any bid may be withdrawn prior to the scheduled time for the opening of bids. Any bid received after the time and date specified shall not be considered. The District also reserves the right to negotiate with a bidder when all bids exceed the budgeted appropriation.

Any questions, please contact Bryan Lane at (603) 435-5526

Please Complete for Bid Submission:

| | |
|------------------------------------|---------------------|
| <u>SUMNERSCAPE</u> | <u>KEVIN SUMNER</u> |
| Vendor Name | Contact Person |
| <u>258 ALTON MTN RD, ALTON BAY</u> | <u>603-812-5721</u> |
| Address | Phone |

BID AMOUNT \$15,000.00 PER YEAR

BID AMOUNT

Signature of Vendor Representative Kevin P. Sumner



REFERENCES FOR KEVIN SUMNER/ SUMNERSCAPE

Current References:

1. Andrew Callaghan (603) 509-0300 cell
Buildings and Grounds Director, Prospect Mountain High School
Date: 2013-present

Work performed: landscape maintenance of high school campus which includes baseball and softball fields, soccer fields, track and field area, common areas, wetland areas. The grass area is approximately 25 acres. Responsible for weekly maintenance, irrigation repair, field maintenance, mulching, flower planting, spring and autumn clean-ups, grading and raking infields, edging baselines, miscellaneous landscape work (i.e seeding, sod work, fence work).

2. Jay Darah (603) 608-6840
Fields Director, Town of Pittsfield, NH
Date: April 2015-present

Work performed: landscape maintenance of Drake Field in Pittsfield, NH. Drake Field is approximately 10 acres and includes baseball, softball and soccer fields. Responsible for weekly maintenance, irrigation start-up, repair and winterization, field maintenance, spring and autumn clean-ups.



PAST AND PRESENT CLIENT LIST

- Avalon Bay Communities
- Avalon at Acton
- Avalon at Bedford Center
- Avalon at Chestnut Hill
- Avalon Estates of Hull
- Avalon at Faxon Park
- Avalon at Hingham Shipyard
- Avalon at Lexington
- Avalon at Lexington Hills
- Avalon at Newton Highlands
- Avalon at Northborough
- Avalon at The Pinehills
- Avalon at Prudential Center
- Beechstone Apartments
- Del Webb
- Eagle's Rest Senior Community
- Fahey Insurance
- Great Bay Community College
- Hall Estates
- Harborview Point at Navy Yard
- Highlands at Faxon Woods
- Highpoint Apartments
- H.O.M.E. Inc
(Housing Opportunities for the Milton Elderly)
- Katahdin Woods
- Longwood Towers
- Marina Bay Condominiums
- Osprey Landing
- Overlook Ridge
- Pittsfield, NH SAU 51
- Presidential Estates
- Prospect Mountain Regional High School
- Roseland Property Management Company
- Rowley Apartments
- The Gilmanton School
- Seton Highlands
- Shaheen Management
- Summit Apartments
- The James O'Reilly Group
- Toyota of Rochester
- Weymouth Ledges



RELEVANT EQUIPMENT LIST

2020 Scag 52" advantage cutting deck
2020 Scag 64" stander
2015 Scag 61" advantage cutting deck
2 2014 Scag 52" deck mower
2012 Scag 48" walk-behind
3 2011 Scag 48" deck mowers
2011 Scag 48" deck mower
8 Back pack blowers
9 Weed trimmers, power and hand tools
2016 Dodge 5500 Dump truck, w/ v plow
2014 Ford f250 Pick-up truck, w/ 8' plow
2009 Ford f350 Pick-up truck, w/ 8' plow
2006 Dodge RAM2500 Pick-up truck, w/ 8' plow
2 Mustang 940 Bobcat w/ 9' plow pusher
Trojan 1500 front end loader w/ 2 yard bucket
3 snow blowers

COMPANY BRIEF



SumnerScape is a multi-faceted, full service landscape and irrigation firm specializing in customized commercial and residential care. We have thirty-five years experience of working with commercial and municipal organizations.

We have made a conscious effort to remain a personal, accessible company. By doing so, we make your job easier by doing ours exceptionally well. We're creative, motivated, and conscientious about our work. We pay attention to the details, because the details make the difference between a so-so commercial landscape and one that is truly outstanding.

We make sure to be on a first name basis with all of our clients/managers. SumnerScape's owner, Kevin, our design director, Yvonne or our senior account representative, James will serve as your point of contact, ensuring clear communication, immediate response time, and hands-on inspection and assessment of properties and their needs.

Our company is comprised of 7 experienced professionals trained and skilled in maintenance, irrigation, flower and landscape design, computer-aided design, landscape lighting, and hardscape.

We strive to establish firm relationships of mutual trust and respect with each and every individual and organization we work with. Whether you are starting a project from scratch or simply need maintenance assistance, the SumnerScape team will work with you to ensure your landscape meets your expectations both functionally and aesthetically.

We love what we do and take pride in each project we do.

PORTFOLIO: PROSPECT MOUNTAIN HIGH SCHOOL, ALTON, NEW HAMPSHIRE



PORTFOLIO: DRAKE FIELD, PITTSFIELD, NEW HAMPSHIRE



PORTFOLIO: GREAT BAY COMMUNITY COLLEGE



PORTFOLIO: MISCELLANEOUS COMMERCIAL PROPERTIES





SCHOOL ADMINISTRATIVE UNIT

#51

23 Oneida Street, Unit 1

Pittsfield, New Hampshire 03263

Phone: (603) 435-5526 • Fax (603) 435-5331

Bryan Lane – Superintendent of Schools

TO: The Pittsfield School Board
FROM: Bryan Lane
DATE: 3/23/22
RE: Policy for reserve fund

With the citizens of Pittsfield voting to allow the District to create a reserve fund, there is a need to create a policy for the administration of that fund. **I recommend a motion to establish the policy as follows:**

POLICY DRF

District Reserve Fund Administration

The District will establish a reserve fund under the specifications of RSA 198:4b, II enacted in 2020 and approved by the voters of Pittsfield on March 8, 2022. At the end of each fiscal year, funds will be added to the reserve fund with the following stipulations:

Adding to the Fund

- The School District will not retain more than 50% of the unexpended fund balance at the end of any fiscal year.
- If the unexpended is in excess of \$300,000 in any fiscal year, the School District will retain no more than \$150,000.
- The balance of the reserve fund will never exceed \$400,000 as a balance.

Expending the Fund

Option 1

Under the rules of RSA 198 4B II, the School Board can consider funding a special project with the Reserve Fund to benefit the School District.

- The special project will be presented by the Superintendent of Schools to the School Board.
- If the School Board finds that there is merit in the project and wishes to move forward, a public meeting will be held to inform the citizens of Pittsfield about the project and the public will be able to provide feedback to the School Board.
- If the School Board finds that the project is worth being put forward with a public vote, the School Board or its' representative will present the project to the Pittsfield Budget Committee.
- If the Budget Committee finds that there is merit in the project and approves through a public vote, the School Board will contact the State Board of Education in order to present the merits of the project to the State School Board.
- If the State School Board votes to approve the project, the School District will move forward to implement the project.



SCHOOL ADMINISTRATIVE UNIT

#51

23 Oneida Street, Unit 1

Pittsfield, New Hampshire 03263

Phone: (603) 435-5526 • Fax (603) 435-5331

Bryan Lane – Superintendent of Schools

Option 2

Under the rules of RSA 198 4B II, the fund can be used as a revenue source to offset expenditures in the annual School District Budget.

- The Superintendent of Schools will present the option to use the Reserve Fund as a revenue source.
- The Board will take a public vote to approve the use of the Reserve Fund to offset if it is presented to them.
- If the School Board votes to use Reserve Fund as a revenue source, the approved budget will be presented to the Pittsfield Budget Committee for their review and approval.
- Final approval of the budget, including using the Reserve Fund as a revenue source, will be by the citizens during the annual election.

DIE

Pittsfield School District

AUDITS

The books and accounts of the Pittsfield School District shall be audited yearly. The audit to be performed will meet the basic audit procedures presented by CPA standards.

The Board shall select the auditors after hearing the recommendation from the superintendent or business administrator. Such audit will be made in accordance with RSA 197:25.

| | |
|-----------|-------------------|
| Reading: | August 18, 2005 |
| Adopted: | September 1, 2005 |
| Reviewed: | September 3, 2009 |
| Reviewed: | February 1, 2018 |

DGA

Pittsfield School District

AUTHORIZED SIGNATURES

Checks drawn on the general fund or any special fund (with the exception of the activity fund) will require the signature of the school district treasurer, who is authorized to sign only after approval of manifests by the Board. Such approval is provided by the signature of two Board members. Checks drawn on an activity fund will require two signatures.

The checks used by the District will be pre-numbered.

| | |
|-----------|-------------------|
| Reading: | August 20, 2009 |
| Adopted: | September 3, 2009 |
| Reviewed: | January 18, 2018 |

TODD RUDIS

4A Red Oak Way, Boscawen, NH | toddrudis@comcsat.net | 603-715-0205

OBJECTIVE | To obtain a position as case manager at Pittsfield Middle-High School

SKILLS & ABILITIES | Strong communication skills. Ability to build relationships with both students and families. Knowledge of Microsoft Office and Google Drive. Adept at using PBISApps behavior management software and Powerschool. Strong interpersonal skills and positive attitude. Certified Special Education Teacher K-12. CPI Certified. Certified in Responsive Classroom.

EXPERIENCE | **SPECIAL EDUCATION CASE MANAGER-CANAAN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL. CANAAN, NH**

8/2020-CURRENT

Case manager for students in grades K-4. Write and coordinate student IEP's, maintain paperwork in accordance with school policy and federal law, communicate with families, coordinate with classroom teachers, plan and deliver specialized instruction.

STUDENT SUPPORT SPECIALIST. PITTSFIELD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL. PITTSFIELD, NH

8/2018-6/2020

In charge of behavior management at a K-6 elementary school. Responsible for de-escalating students and helping plan their return to class. Consult with administration on decisions regarding out of school suspensions. Coordinate natural consequences for other student behavior. Manage student re-entry meetings with student, families and classroom teachers. Coordinate and develop classroom behavior plans with class teams. Communicate with families regarding suspensions, or other behavior related concerns.

STUDENT SUPPORT SPECIALIST. PITTSFIELD MIDDLE HIGH SCHOOL. PITTSFIELD, NH

10/2015-6/2018

Received behavior referrals from classroom teachers and processed with students. Helped identify triggers, and provided potential replacement behaviors. When necessary, assigned detentions and in-school suspensions. Consulted with administration on decisions for out of school suspensions. Contacted families regarding disciplinary decisions. Coordinated and managed student reentry meetings with students and

families. Assisted in de-escalating students and preparing them for a return to class.

**TITLE ONE READING INSTRUCTOR. PARKER-VARNEY
ELEMENTARY SCHOOL. MANCHESTER, NH**

8/2015-10/2016

Supervised class use of reading program on Chromebooks. Planned and gave individual and small group instruction to students in grades K-5.

**ONE-ON-ONE PARAPROFESSIONAL. PARKER-VARNEY
ELEMENTARY. MANCHESTER, NH**

1/2015-6/2015

One on one aide for a 4th grade student with emotional behavior disorder and Cerebral Palsy. Responsible for delivering planned instruction and managing individual student behavior plan.

**LEAD TEACHER ALTERNATIVE PROGRAM. FRANKLIN HIGH
SCHOOL. FRANKLIN, NH.**

1/2014-6/2014

Lead teacher for 12 students aged 15 and above in alternative classroom setting. Responsibilities included planning credit recovery and monitoring online course progress

**STUDENT SUPPORT ROOM MONITOR. FRANKLIN HIGH SCHOOL.
FRANKLIN, NH.**

10/2011-1/2014

Supervised room where students reported for disrupting the classroom. Processed behaviors, identified triggers, provided alternative behaviors and potential solutions. Determined whether students were ready to return to class.

HOME CARE SPECIALISTS, INC. HAVERHILL, MA.

6/1999-9/2011

Inventory control and purchasing manager 6/1999-6/2008. Branch manager for Concord, NH location 6/2008-9/2011

EDUCATION | FRANKLIN PIERCE UNIVERSITY, RINGE, NH

MASTER'S OF EDUCATION

Earned Master's Degree in General Special Education. Elective coursework focused on behavior management

MERRIMACK COLLEGE, ANDOVER, MA
BACHELOR OF ARTS, POLITICAL SCIENCE

LEADERSHIP | FRANKLIN HIGH SCHOOL VARSITY GOLF COACH 2012-2014
FRANKLIN HIGH SCHOOL VARSITY BASEBALL COACH 2015

REFERENCES | **KIM MORGANTI**, DISTRICT BEHAVIOR SPECIALIST
PITTSFIELD SCHOOL DISTRICT 603-435-5526

SARAH JEAN-GILLES, 6TH GRADE TEACHER
PITTSFIELD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 603-435-8432

Available on Request

Quinn Boyce

194 West Hancock Street Apt 2, Manchester NH | (603) 534-7314 | quinnboyce123@gmail.com

Education

- ❖ BA in English: Teacher Cert Option 5-12 from Plymouth State University, *Summa Cum Laude* 2021
- ❖ *Ernest L Silver Award* recipient and *Distinguished English Graduate Award* recipient 2021
- ❖ Completed teaching internship at Merrimack Valley Middle School
- ❖ AS in Education from NHTI Concord's Community College *High Honors* 2019
- ❖ NHTI and Plymouth State *Dean's Award* recipient

Experience

JUNIOR HIGH ENGLISH TEACHER | ST. JOHN REGIONAL SCHOOL | SUMMER 2021-PRESENT

- ❖ Taught 6th, 7th, and 8th grade students
- ❖ Helped students reach mastery in text analysis
- ❖ Devised and implemented engaging vocabulary lessons
- ❖ Kept students on-task while maintaining a supportive atmosphere

SUBSTITUTE TEACHER | MERRIMACK VALLEY SCHOOL DISTRICT | SPRING 2021

- ❖ Followed instructions left by classroom teachers
- ❖ Maintained an active and engaging classroom atmosphere
- ❖ Prioritized time between several classrooms during the workday

PARAPROFESSIONAL | PITTSFIELD SCHOOL DISTRICT | FALL 2015-SUMMER 2019 SEASONAL

- ❖ Worked one-on-one and in groups with exceptional students (3rd and 8th grade)
- ❖ Supported students in the classroom and maintained safe atmosphere
- ❖ Developed personalized lessons
- ❖ Addressed attention and behavior goals with students

Skills & Abilities

COMMUNICATION

- ❖ Collaborated and engaged with students, teachers, and admin to complete complex tasks
- ❖ Lead discussions with creativity and ease
- ❖ Sought out answers to questions that will help improve his work and craft
- ❖ Deescalated problems quickly and cordially

CLERICAL SKILLS/ MISCELLANEOUS

- ❖ Proficient with Microsoft Office programs such as *Word, PowerPoint, Excel, Publisher, and Teams*
- ❖ Proficient with Google Suite of programs such as *Docs, Slides, Sheets, Forms, and Classroom*
- ❖ Ran several classes virtually and in-person

EDC

Pittsfield School District

AUTHORIZED USE OF SCHOOL-OWNED MATERIALS AND EQUIPMENT

School equipment may not be used for any purpose other than school, school-related, civic, or educational purposes, with the exception of computer equipment. Mobile devices, used outside of the school network, must give priority to school district functions and should continue to be used in the spirit of the Acceptable Use Policy.

The Board shall permit school equipment to be loaned to staff members when such use is related to their employment and to students when the equipment is to be used in connection with their studies or extracurricular activities. A written agreement will be used, which specifies the borrower's responsibility to return the equipment in the condition in which it was received, and his/her financial responsibility for any loss or damage, which will meet the requirements of all applicable insurance.

Reading: January 21, 2010
Adopted: February 4, 2010
Amended: February 14, 2013
Reviewed: March 27, 2014
Reviewed: April 19, 2018



SCHOOL ADMINISTRATIVE UNIT #51

23 Oneida Street, Unit 1
Pittsfield, New Hampshire 03263
Phone: (603) 435-5526 • Fax (603) 435-5331
Bryan Lane – Superintendent of Schools

TO: The Pittsfield School Board
FROM: Bryan Lane
DATE: 5/18/2022
RE: Nomination for Kindergarten Teacher

Please accept this as the nomination for Kim Coronati to fill the vacant Kindergarten teaching position at Pittsfield Elementary School. Ms. Coronati has a Bachelor's degree from Colby College in International Studies and a Master's degree from the University of New Hampshire, in Elementary Education. She has three years of teaching experience with first grade students in Barrington, NH. Mrs. Coronati has a current teaching certificate in New Hampshire.

After taking time off to raise her family Ms. Coronati has worked as a para-educator in Deerfield since 2009 in a preschool environment. She is ready to get back to teaching full time and is looking forward to having her own classroom. In our conversation, she has had experience in working with student to identify their readiness to read and developing strategies to improve student's skills in both literacy and numeracy. She has a great energy and the team of staff that interviewed her felt strongly that she would be a great addition to the PES staff.

There were five candidates for this position and the interview team consisted of Mr. Wiley and members of the teaching staff at PES. This is a grant funded position with a budgeted salary of \$44,118. I recommend a motion to approve the nomination of Kimberly Coronati at a salary of \$41,315, Masters Step 3.

Kim Coronati

1 Ridge View Lane
Deerfield, NH 03037
(603)770-7526
coronati@metrocast.net

Experience

Deerfield Community School, Deerfield, NH — *Paraprofessional*

August 2009- PRESENT

Work as a preschool teacher's assistant

Worked as a shared and one on one aide

Modify lessons

Teach Foundations and Handwriting Without Tears

Provide structure to help students complete daily tasks

Collaborate with classroom teachers, special educators, and paraprofessionals

Deerfield Cooperative Preschool — *Volunteer and Fundraising Co-Chair*

August 2006 - June 2009

Helped with art projects, science experiments, and literacy and math games

Organized many fundraising events to benefit DCP

Barrington Elementary School, Barrington, NH — *First Grade Teacher*

August 2000- June 2003

Built a classroom community

Used Open Court Reading for two years

Taught reading based on LRR (Learn to Read by Reading) model

Taught Everyday Math

Worked with students individually, in small groups, and in a whole group

Was attentive to each student's strengths and difficulties

Collaborated with other teachers to create the most successful learning environment for our students

Barrington Elementary School, Barrington, NH — *Full Time Student Teacher*

August 1999- June 2000

Developed and modified lesson plans while collaborating with a fourth grade classroom teacher

Participated in parent conferences, quarterly student grade evaluations, and all daily classroom functions

Taught independently for two weeks which fulfilled Master of Education requirements

Utilized Everyday Math

Instilled an intrinsic value system within the classroom by building students' self-confidence and limiting extrinsic rewards

Assessed students regularly by means of observations, rubrics, and written and oral



SCHOOL ADMINISTRATIVE UNIT #51

23 Oneida Street, Unit 1

Pittsfield, New Hampshire 03263

Phone: (603) 435-5526 • Fax (603) 435-5331

Bryan Lane – Superintendent of Schools

TO: The Pittsfield School Board
FROM: Bryan Lane
DATE: 3/10/22
RE: Nomination for Grade 9/10 English

Please accept this as the nomination Quinn Boyce to fill an open teaching position in English at the middle/high school. Mr. Boyce has an Associate's degree from NHTI in Concord and a Bachelor's degree in English Education at Plymouth State University. Currently he is working as an English teacher at St. John Regional School in Concord. Previous to that he worked for four years in our school District working with Special Education students.

In speaking with Mr. Boyce, his long term goal has become to and English teacher. His background working with special needs students will give him an advantage in working with students who may be struggling. While at Plymouth State, he earned the Ernest L. Silver Award as a distinguished English student. Mr. Boyce had opportunities to go to other school districts but he is a product of the Pittsfield School District and feels that this is the best fit for him.

There were limited number of candidates for this position and Mr. Hamilton worked with the staff to bring this nomination forward. The budgeted salary for this position was \$42,984. I recommend a motion to recommend Quinn Boyce as an English teacher at a salary of \$38,137, Bachelor's step 5.



SCHOOL ADMINISTRATIVE UNIT #51

23 Oneida Street, Unit 1

Pittsfield, New Hampshire 03263

Phone: (603) 435-5526 • Fax (603) 435-5331

Bryan Lane – Superintendent of Schools

TO: The Pittsfield School Board
FROM: Bryan Lane
DATE: 3/10/22
RE: Nomination for Special Education Teacher

Please accept this as the nomination Todd Rudis to fill an open teaching position in Special Education at the middle/high school. Mr. Rudis has Bachelor's degree in Political Science from Merrimack College and a Master's degree in Special Education from Franklin Pierce University. For the past two years he has been working at Canaan Elementary school as a case manager and previously to that he worked in our school district with Special Education students. He has also served as a para-educator in Manchester and Franklin.

In speaking with Mr. Rudis, he has a strong desire to get back into a secondary school having found that is the age group he really wants to work with. He will be working in the "Flex" program and he has strong experiences in working with students who have fallen behind and have difficulty in making it through the school day. There were strong references from current staff and they are looking forward to having him back on staff.

There were limited number of candidates for this position and Ms. Bickford worked with the staff to bring this nomination forward. The budgeted salary for this position was \$37,117. I recommend a motion to nominate Todd Rudis as a special education teacher at a salary of \$46,064, Master's step 8.

CHCA

Pittsfield School District

APPROVAL OF HANDBOOKS AND DIRECTIVES

In order that pertinent Board policies, regulations, and school rules and procedures may be known by all staff members and students affected by them, district administrators are granted authority to issue staff and student handbooks as found necessary and desirable.

It is essential that the contents of all handbooks conform with district-wide policies and regulations. The Board expects all handbooks to be approved prior to publication by the Board and superintendent.

| | |
|-----------|--------------------|
| Adopted: | November 10, 1982 |
| Amended: | January 25, 1990 |
| Reviewed: | September 24, 1992 |
| Reviewed: | September 4, 1996 |
| Reviewed: | May 21, 2009 |
| Amended: | November 16, 2017 |

Pittsfield School District

ASSESSMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS

The superintendent will develop and manage an assessment program that provides ongoing evaluation of the effectiveness of the curriculum on improving student performance. The program must adhere to the processes for selection, use, and interpretation of assessment instruments specified below. This program will include both local and statewide assessment tools. The program must be aligned with the goals of the school district and be designed to assess each student's progress toward meeting the defined curriculum objectives.

Definitions. For the purposes of assessment of high school course work through the demonstration of student mastery of course competencies, the following definitions are established:

Course Level Competency: the expected content, concepts, and skills to be mastered in a course.

Competency Assessment: the process by which a student demonstrates sufficient evidence of learning.

Mastery: a student presenting sufficient evidence of attainment of the required competencies.

Selection of Assessment Instruments. The selection process will include input from the professional staff in its efforts to investigate new assessment tools and evaluate existing ones. Assessment instruments selected will provide an authentic evaluation of student learning outcomes through multiple formative and summative assessment instruments including, but not limited to, teacher observation of project-based learning, including off-site learning projects; competency-based assessment; rubrics; and teacher-designed quizzes and tests. Additional instruments may include written examinations, alternative questions, demonstrations, writing exercises, individual projects, group projects, performances, student portfolios, and samples of the student's best works.

Administration and Use of Assessment Instruments. The assessment program will include an approximate schedule for when common assessment tools will be administered to students. The schedule will be distributed to staff and the Board before the start of each school year. Teachers will not be bound by this schedule and may still administer tests, quizzes, and other assessment tools as they deem necessary.

The dean of instruction will provide assurance that test procedures are followed at the school level, including the distribution and collection of test materials, test security, use of test results, and testing dates, as well as other pertinent requirements. Readiness

ILBA

assessment shall be administered to all children entering kindergarten. Disabled students must be provided the opportunity to participate in all student assessments. Any modifications in administration should be made and documented during the Individualized Education Program (IEP) review.

Assessment Results. Assessment results will be analyzed and used with other data for the following purposes:

- To identify individual student strengths and weaknesses in skill development;
- To diagnose strengths and weaknesses of groups;
- To individualize instruction;
- To report progress to parents;
- To select curriculum materials;
- To set the pace of instruction;
- To select methods of instruction;
- To counsel students;
- To help determine revisions needed in the curriculum.

Interpretation of Assessment Instruments. The superintendent or designee will ensure that data from the student assessment program is compiled, analyzed, summarized, and reported to the Board annually. The superintendent or designee is responsible for the scores of individual students and they shall be made available only to appropriate personnel within the school in which the student is enrolled and to parent(s) or legal guardian(s) of each student as provided by law. Interpretation of test results shall be made available to parents and students.

The Board will provide funding for the student assessment program, including professional development for teachers in the use of tools to understand assessment results, to adjust instruction to meet the personalized needs of students, and to monitor progress.

The superintendent will provide an ongoing evaluation of the assessment program and will provide regular reports to the Board showing the effectiveness of the curriculum on improving student performance. Throughout, the focus of the district's assessment program will be of and for student learning.

Evaluation of Assessment Instruments. The superintendent will evaluate the instructional programs annually in accordance with Board policies and state guidelines. He/she shall have the responsibility to report annually to the Board on the progress the district is making towards the attainment of its educational goals.

Reading: April 16, 2009
Adopted: May 7, 2009
Amended: December 4, 2014
Reviewed: October 18, 2018

Pittsfield School District

ASSIGNMENT OF STUDENTS TO CLASSES AND GRADE LEVELS

Students will be enrolled in grades and classes in which they can be expected to master established district instructional and learning objectives. All students who are included under the compulsory attendance law must be enrolled and required to attend all classes prescribed by the state and the district unless exempt by the school authorities.

Students will be placed in the grade level and class that best meets the student's academic needs, after consultation between the dean of instruction, other district personnel, and the student's parent/guardian.

Students transferring into the district will be placed in the grade level and class that best meets the student's needs, after review of the records from the student's prior school, and after consultation between the director of college and career readiness, dean of instruction, other district personnel, and the student's parents.

Students receiving special education services will be placed in accordance with applicable law.

The decision of the dean of instruction (for continuing students) and the decision of the director of college and career readiness (for transferring students) regarding student placement may be appealed to the superintendent, and then to the School Board. The School Board will give significant consideration to the dean of instruction's, the director of college and career readiness, and superintendent's recommended placement.

Reading: September 17, 2009
Adopted: October 1, 2009
Amended: January 8, 2015
Amended: December 6, 2018

Pittsfield School District

ATTENDANCE, ABSENTEEISM, AND TRUANCY

Absences. The Board requires that school-aged children enrolled in the district attend school in accordance with all applicable state laws and Board policies. The educational program offered by the district is predicated upon the presence of the student and requires continuity of instruction and classroom participation in order for students to achieve academic standards and consistent educational progress.

Attendance shall be required of all students enrolled in the district during the days and hours that school is in session, except that the dean of operations may excuse a student for temporary absences when receiving satisfactory evidence of conditions or reasons that may reasonably cause the student's absence.

The Board considers the following to be excused absences:

1. Illness;
2. Recovery from an accident;
3. Required court attendance;
4. Medical and dental appointments;
5. Death in the immediate family;
6. Observation or celebration of a bona fide religious holiday;
7. Such other good cause as may be acceptable to the dean of operations or permitted by law.

Any absence that has not been excused for any of these reasons will be considered an unexcused absence.

In the event of an illness, parents/guardians must call the school and inform the district of the student's illness and absence. For other absences, parents must provide written notice or a written excuse that states one of the above reasons for non-attendance. The dean of operations may require parents to provide additional documentation in support of their written notice including, but not limited to, doctor's notes, court documents, obituaries, or other documents supporting the claimed reason for non-attendance.

If parents wish for their child to be absent for a reason not listed above, the parent must provide a written explanation of the reason for such absence, including why the student will be absent and for how long the student will be absent. The dean of operations will make a determination as to whether the stated reason for the student's absence constitutes good cause and will notify the parents via telephone and writing of his/her decision. If the dean of operations determines that good cause does not exist, the parents may request a conference with the dean of operations to again explain the reasons for non-attendance. The dean of operations may then reconsider his/her initial determination. However, at this juncture, the dean of operation's decision shall be final.

Family Vacations / Educational Opportunities. Generally, absences other than for illness during the school year are discouraged. The dean of operations or his/her designee may, however, grant special approval of absence for family vacations, provided written approval is given in advance. Parents are asked to submit a family vacation / educational opportunity request form to the dean of operations at least two weeks prior to the planned trip for absence(s) to be considered excused. This advance communication will allow teachers enough time to work with parents and the student regarding homework completion.

Truancy. Truancy is defined as any unexcused absence from class or school. Any absence that has not been excused for any of the reasons listed above will be considered an unexcused absence.

Ten half-days of unexcused absence during a school year constitute habitual truancy. A half-day absence is defined as a student missing more than two hours of instructional time and less than three and one-half hours of instructional time. Any absence of more than three and one-half hours of instructional time shall be considered a full-day absence.

The dean of operations is hereby designated as the district employee responsible for overseeing truancy issues.

Chronic Absenteeism. Chronic absenteeism is defined as being absent from school for ten percent or greater of the academic year for any reason, including both excused and unexcused absences, suspensions, and time missed due to changing schools. Based on a 180-day school year, being absent for eighteen or more days in a school year is considered chronic absenteeism.

The dean of operations is designated as the district employee responsible for overseeing chronic absenteeism issues.

Intervention Process to Address Truancy and Chronic Absenteeism. The dean of operations shall ensure that the administrative guidelines on attendance properly address the matter of truancy and chronic absenteeism by including a process that identifies students who are habitually truant or chronically absent, as defined above.

When the dean of operations identifies a student who is habitually truant is in danger of becoming habitually truant, chronically absent, or in danger of becoming chronically absent, he/she shall commence an intervention with the student, the student's parents / guardians, and other staff members as may be deemed necessary. The intervention shall include the processes including, but not limited to:

1. Investigates the cause(s) of the student's truant behavior;

2. Considers, when appropriate, modification of his/her educational program to meet particular needs that may be causing the truancy or chronic absenteeism;
3. Involves the parents in the development of a plan designed to reduce the truancy or chronic absenteeism; and
4. Seeks alternative disciplinary measures, but still retains the right to impose discipline in accordance with the district's policies and administrative guidelines on student discipline.

Parental Involvement in Truancy Intervention and Chronic Absenteeism. When a student reaches habitual truancy status, ~~or~~ is in danger of reaching habitual truancy status, has reached chronically absent status, or is in danger of reaching chronically absent status, the dean of operations will send the student's parent/guardian a letter which includes:

1. A statement that the student has become or is in danger of becoming habitually truant or chronically absent;
2. A statement of the parent's responsibility to ensure that the student attends school; and
3. A request for a meeting between the parents/guardians and the dean of operations and/or his/her designee(s) to discuss the student's truancy and to develop a plan for reducing the student's truancy.

Developing and Coordinating Strategies for Truancy Reduction and Chronic Absenteeism. The Board encourages the administration to seek truancy-prevention, ~~and~~ truancy-reduction, chronic absenteeism-prevention, and chronic absenteeism-reduction strategies along with the recommendations listed below. However, these guidelines shall be advisory only. The superintendent is authorized to develop and utilize other means, guidelines, and programs aimed at preventing and reducing truancy.

1. Coordinate truancy-prevention and chronic absenteeism-prevention strategies based on the early identification of truancy, such as prompt notification of absences to parents/guardians.
2. Assist school staff to develop site attendance plans by providing development strategies, resources, and referral procedures.

Parental Notification of Truancy and Chronic Absenteeism Policy. Prior to adopting this policy, the Board will place the item on the agenda of a public School Board meeting and will allow two weeks for public input as to the policy's provisions. Any public input shall be advisory only and final adoption as to the policy's provisions will remain solely with the Board.

JH

Additionally, the dean of operations shall also ensure that this policy is included in or referenced in the student handbook and is mailed to parents annually at the beginning of each school year.

Reading: September 3, 2009
Adopted: September 17, 2009
Reading: September 9, 2010
Revised: September 22, 2010
Reviewed: January 15, 2015
Amended: December 20, 2018