

**REGULAR SCHOOL COMMITTEE MEETING OF  
THE LOWELL SCHOOL COMMITTEE MEETING**  
*As Amended*

January 5, 2011

The Regular Meeting of the Lowell School Committee took place in the Council Chambers, City Hall, at 7:00 pm, on the above-mentioned date.

**ROLL CALL**

On roll call at 7:01 pm, all members were present, namely: Jacqueline A. Doherty, Alison P. B. Laraba, John J. Leahy, James D. Leary, Connie A. Martin, Mayor/Chairman James L. Milinazzo and David J. Conway

**MINUTES**

1. Regular School Committee Meeting Minutes of December 15, 2010

Ms. Martin moved to approve; seconded by Ms. Laraba. APPROVED

**PERMISSION TO ENTER**

Dr. Chris A. Scott, Superintendent, presented and recommended the following contracts for School Committee approval:

-----  
EDUCATION, INC. ----- \$ **90,000**  
15 Main Street Extension, Suite #5  
Plymouth, MA 02360

To provide academic support and tutoring services to Special Education students who are hospitalized

Funding provided by the Special education Hospital Tutoring Account

-----  
GERMAINE LAWRENCE INCORPORATED ----- \$ **32,149**  
18 Claremont Avenue  
Arlington, MA 02476

To provide for the out-of-district tuition costs for one student enrolled and receiving services as outlined in their Special Education Individualized Education Program (IEP)

Funding provided by the Lowell School Department - Special Education Tuition Account  
-----

COMMUNITY RAINING AND ASSISTANCE CENTER, INC. ----- \$ 35,000  
30 Winter Street  
Boston, MA 02108

To provide administrators and teachers professional development on key concepts related to the Murkland School Redesign Process

Funding provided by the School Improvement Bridge Grant

---

Ms. Martin moved:

To accept the recommendation of the Superintendent to approve all contract for permission to enter; seconded by Mr. Conway. Unanimously approved on roll call. APPROVED

**MEMORIALS** - The Committee as a Whole stood for a 'Moment of Silence' in memory of the following:

1. Corinna Ouer, former Lowell Public School student
2. Rita Santry, mother of Christine Santry, Sullivan School teacher
3. Rita M. (Dube) Cote, mother-in-law of Nancy Cote, Business Office clerk

Mayor Milinazzo requested a **Suspension of the Rules** to talk about the tragic shooting over on Grant Street in Lowell on New Year's Eve.

Mr. Leahy moved:

For a **Suspension of the Rules**; seconded by Mr. Leary. **Suspension** APPROVED

Mr. Milinazzo stated that he wanted to bring the Committee up-to-date from a standpoint of what happened last night at the City Council meeting. He also mentioned that he did get a notice that the memorial and prayer service was scheduled for the victim, Corinna Ouer, on Friday, January 7<sup>th</sup>, at 2:30 pm at the Dolan Funeral Home. On January 8<sup>th</sup>, there is also a service at the Trairatanaram Temple at 21 Quigley Avenue, North Chelmsford, MA. At the City Council meeting last night they did **Suspend the Rules** to talk about this tragic event. A Public Safety Subcommittee is scheduled for Tuesday, January 11, 2011 at 5:00 pm. Superintendent Scott has been invited along with Kenneth Lavallee, Superintendent of Police, Gerard T. Leone, Jr., District Attorney, and anyone from the School Committee is also invited to listen to steps the community is taking to try to deal with this issue we find ourselves faced with. It is a tragic event and our hearts go out to the family of Corinna Ouer and all the others that were injured during the shootings that happened that night. He appreciated the **Suspension of the Rules**. Obviously, the School Committee will continue to discuss issues of safety, especially in our schools going forward.

---

Dr. Chris A. Scott, Superintendent, also on behalf of the Lowell School Department wanted to express her condolences to the family of Corinna Ouer, the individuals, and families that were affected by this tragedy. She shared the steps that were taken to reach out to the local community:

- Continue to work with the Lowell Police Department
- Students from various schools across our system continue to be monitored
  - by Lowell School Department staff
  - by Police Department staff
- If required, families as well as students are being provided counseling
- Monday morning (January 3<sup>rd</sup>) Headmaster Rozmiarek meet with his staff
  - to talk about the incident with staff
  - to raise issues
- A Crisis Intervention Team was put together at Lowell High School
- A counseling center was set up at the high school

On Monday morning (January 3<sup>rd</sup>), she met with Kenneth Lavalley, Superintendent of Police, Gerard T. Leone, Jr., District Attorney, Bernard Lynch, City Manager and others to discuss the matter and to make sure every step was taken for those involved in this tragic incident. She wanted people to know that if people have concerns they can contact the Police Department. Superintendent Lavalley wanted her to convey the message that they do think at this time that things are safe and everything is under control. All services are being provided. The School Department will continue to work collaboratively with the Police Department. She thought it would be appropriate at this time to acknowledge that Corinna Ouer went to the Leblanc School. She was registered at the Middlesex Community College. Jane Campbell, Coordinator of the Leblanc School, wrote today and just wanted to acknowledge the staff's sadness around the death of this particular student. Jane Campbell stated in her letter that people speak very highly of her. *“Corinna was compassionate, caring, engaging and we will all miss her contagious smile. Our condolences to her family.”*

Members of the Committee expressed their concerns. Mr. Leahy felt that the high school should have responded sooner. He felt that the Committee should have received a call sooner. The Committee should have been informed sooner of what the high school was doing.

Mr. Conway wanted to know if other students at the high school were affected by this incident.

Dr. Chris A. Scott, Superintendent, responded in the affirmative. She stated counselors were in place at the high school to help these students deal with this tragic event. The counselors were notified on Sunday and ready to go on Monday morning (January 3<sup>rd</sup>).

Mr. Conway stated that students should feel safe in school. The number one concern of parents is to make sure their children are safe in school. He thanked the administration and the high school staff for their quick response.

Ms. Laraba stated that she wanted to follow up on the students feeling safe. Her understanding was that once the students were identified, counselors were informed Sunday night, and the counselors were in place on Monday. That is exactly what happened. The principals and the Headmaster were taking the time to make sure the kids, the students, at each of these schools understood not only that these services were available for them, but that they were in an atmosphere and an environment that was safe. If these students had any concerns, they would address them. She just wanted to clarify Mr. Leahy's point that we may have only received the call that evening, but the students at large, the most important, were focused on first. She thought the message she received from Headmaster Rozmiarek was very well written. She received his message prior to heading out to her meetings. He was factual about it, to the point, and he assured us that business is going on as usual at the high school. They have had extra meetings about security. She wanted to thank Headmaster Rozmiarek and the high school staff for the work that they did. She also thanked Ann Murphy, Assistant Superintendent for Support Services, for sending an email out to the Committee over the weekend stating the steps that were being taken as the Superintendent was away. When the Superintendent returned, she followed up with conversations with Superintendent Lavalley and Headmaster Rozmiarek.

Ms. Doherty stated that she has two children at Lowell High School. They feel absolutely safe, and she feels they are absolutely safe. They had scheduled a Safety & Discipline/Alternative School Program Subcommittee meeting for next Wednesday (January 12<sup>th</sup>). The primary issue on the agenda will be safety issues. They had already scheduled this prior to the incident. It was her understanding (all of their meetings are opened to the public anyway), we have physically invited security staff, police officers at the high school to feel free to come and talk to us about safety and security issues at the high school. She wanted to know if the Superintendent could update them on that. It will be held at the Henry J. Mroz Administration Offices Edith Nourse Rogers School Wednesday, January 12, 2011, at 6 pm.

Dr. Chris A. Scott, Superintendent, thanked Mr. Conway for setting this meeting up. She stated that police officers and various security have been invited. Mr. Conway also invited administration. Jack Dolan, who has really worked with us as one of the liaisons from the Police Department for the last five years, has also stated that he would be in attendance to answer any questions the Committee or the community has. We have encouraged people to come out and hear whatever issues people want to discuss. *"We want people to know that our lines of communication are opened and that our high school is safe."*

Mayor Milinazzo stated that he appreciated the **Suspension of the Rules** to discuss this tragic incident. He will be at the Subcommittee on Safety Issues with the Council on Tuesday and with the School Committee on Wednesday evening as well. It was very important to get the message to the parents and guardians of our public school students that they are indeed safe.

**For the record**, we are now back on the regular agenda.

---

## MOTIONS

1. (by James D. Leary) – Request the Superintendent, Central Administration and the Lowell City Solicitor review the current Lowell Public School Desegregation policy, current School Zones and Transportation plan in order to determine if there are any potential costs savings and improvement of student services, which would be achieved by making changes to all or some of the existing aforementioned policies for the upcoming 2011/2012 school year. The review would include any negative impacts made as a result of altering one or all of the existing policies; seconded by Mr. Leahy. APPROVED

Mr. Leary stated that he this was something that he had touched base with the City Solicitor, the Superintendent, and a variety of administrators at the Central Office since the summer of this year. It is complicated. He has an idea of how it will come out, but the legal aspect of it is very challenging. In terms of getting ready for the budget year, this is something we need to look at as opposed to cutting items. He thinks this School Committee has shown great initiative in terms of looking at reorganizations and doing things in a way that is beneficial to our student population as well as our staff. Schools have changed. Whenever that happens, we need to do things quicker as opposed to the actual budget timeframe. Everyone he has spoken to from John Descoteaux, Family Resource Center Coordinator, to the City Solicitor, Christine O'Connor, thought it was a good idea. In the interest of doing things in a thoughtful, creative manner, he thinks it is a good item for the School Committee to look at.

Mr. Conway applauded Mr. Leary for coming up with this idea. He thought that the Committee has to look at everything that might save some money whether we agree with it or not. He believes this situation goes back to 1988 when Lowell went to the desegregation plan. Former Superintendent George N. Tsapatsaris, former Mayor Richard P. Howe, and City Solicitor Thomas Sweeney put the desegregation plan together to make sure it was right for the school system and to make sure it wasn't taken over by the federal government. He wanted to make a suggestion that when the team mentioned in the motion sits down to discuss Mr. Leary's motion that they touch base with these three individuals he just mentioned. They have that institutional history of what took place. They could give us ideas going forward if there were going to be any pitfalls or hurdles we might have to look at.

Ms. Laraba stated that somewhere in her mind she thought there had been conversations about our desegregation order and trying to get that vacated or canceled so we wouldn't be under the same kind of strains. She referred to Mr. Leary to answer her question.

Mr. Leary stated that when he spoke to the City Solicitor, she actually involved Tom (Thomas) Sweeny. We had almost a two hour conversation regarding:

- How they came about the desegregation order
- How they went about doing it

Tom Sweeney was our Attorney on record (he was the City Solicitor of Lowell) at that time. The present City Solicitor (Christine O'Connor) said that if his motion came forward, Tom Sweeney would be the focal point, and he would talk to former Mayor Dick (Richard) Howe as well as the former Superintendent George N. Tsapatsaris. They would be part of the process of reviewing. It is vacating an order or not vacating an order. That is exactly what they would be looking at. This is a huge piece to look at. The second piece is the school zones. If you look at the zones, some of the areas like Pawtucketville with the number of students versus the buildings out there; there are more students than building size. That is the other component. There is also the transportation piece. It is a huge process to look at. It involves multiple departments, but if we are to cut 5 or 10 million dollars, we have to go through the diligence. To vacate an order or not to vacate an order, there are so many pieces that need to come together. If we have to consider laying off human beings again, this is something we should look at. It is complicated. The people he has spoken to:

- City Solicitor
- Transportation Director
- Assistant Superintendent
- Superintendent

They think this is something meaningful to look at. Before we cut teachers, we can say we looked at all meaningful ways to cut expenses. Again, we are looking at thoughtful ways. It doesn't make things less painful when you cut jobs, but at least we can look people in the eye and say, "*We did the best we could!*"

Mr. Leahy wanted to know if there was a timeline on the desegregation order.

Mayor Milinazzo stated that he didn't believe so. He would double check this and forward Mr. Leahy the information.

Mr. Leary stated that he doesn't think anyone here except Mr. Conway was involved when the desegregation order was issued. People have knowledge of what it means, but what does it really mean legally? Even if it doesn't change, at least we will have an updated review of:

- why we have that desegregation order
- what it means
- what steps are available

That is what he wants.

Mr. Conway stated that he was glad Tom Sweeney and the other two (Richard Howe, George N. Tsapatsaris) were all involved. He wanted a point of clarification. He wanted to

know if four or five years ago they changed the school zones with former Superintendent Karla Brooks Baehr.

Mayor Milinazzo recognized Ann Murphy, Assistant Superintendent for Support Services.

Assistant Superintendent Murphy stated that the last revisions to the voluntary desegregation plan was in 2003 when we actually rezoned some of the schools and added a third zone. That was the last time there was a thorough look and redesign of our zones. It was in 2003.

2. (by James D. Leary) – Request the school administration allow employees who were laid off due to Lowell School budget cuts and that were in good employment standing prior to that lay off, be allowed to attend study training programs without financial stipends provided to current employees; seconded by Mr. Leahy for discussion.

Mr. Leary stated that the reason he brought this motion forward was that certain folks were trying to get ELA certification. We have self-study groups that are going on in the department. It is apparently a very challenging test to take. We are actually paying our current employees a stipend to go to these ELA study groups. If we can make it available to the folks we laid off, they can come in and be part of the study group. We can't pay them stipend obviously per the contract, but if they are available at the time, they can be part of the process. ELA came to his mind, but there are other programs. People that we have laid off through no fault of their own and are in good standing could join these study groups.

Ms. Laraba stated that the only thing that comes to her mind is that if we are charged for this study group?

Dr. Chris A. Scott, Superintendent, stated that we have many study groups. She would have to have specific details to answer Ms. Laraba's question fully. She understands the intent of Mr. Leary's motion that if we are running professional development opportunities in the district, then people who were laid off (and there is no additional cost to the system) can attend.

Mr. Leary concurred with the Superintendent's understanding of his motion.

Mr. Conway wanted to know if there was a mechanism in place to notify these people who were laid off of the courses available.

Dr. Chris A. Scott, Superintendent, stated that they only have the last address that was on file when these people were laid off.

Mr. Conway stated that was understandable.

Ms. Laraba wanted to know if the course offerings were on the School Department website.

Dr. Chris A. Scott, Superintendent, stated that professional development was offered. Some of the courses Mr. Leary had been talking about might be school-based so it wouldn't be a district-run professional development offering. We do have some courses that we run district-wide. What Mr. Conway said about notification, there would be a cost associated with mailings. There would be the cost of postage and also a cost of time for staff to do the mailings. She doesn't want to sound mean about it, but there is that cost to consider.

Ms. Laraba stated that if we put something up on our website, word-of-mouth works very well amongst our teachers. Those that are interested would be made aware very quickly. That would save us the cost of sending out mailings.

Ms. Laraba wanted to clarify that there would be no additional cost to us.

Mr. Leary stated that if Ms. Laraba wanted **to amend** his motion to add if there was no additional cost to the system, it was fine with him.

Mr. Laraba moved **to amend** Mr. Leary's motion:

If there was no additional cost to the school district; seconded by Ms. Doherty.

**For clarification**, the motion by Mr. Leary **as amended** by Ms. Laraba now reads:

Request the school administration allow employees who were laid off due to Lowell School budget cuts and that were in good employment standing prior to that lay off, be allowed to attend study training programs without financial stipends provided to current employees if there is no additional cost to the school district; seconded by Ms. Doherty. APPROVED

3. (by James D. Leary) – Request the Superintendent look into the feasibility of the Lowell High School Colleen Creagan TV Studio producing technology type teacher training videos; seconded by Mr. Conway. APPROVED

Mr. Leary stated that this was not his idea. This idea was from the great John McDonough. He pointed out to him that his wife was a teacher at one of our schools. A fantastic teacher, a computer teacher who had a lot of knowledge. She was working with teachers trying to develop programs with utilization of X-2. He thought it was a great idea, because we don't have computer teachers anymore. If we could put some courses online, we could provide training to our teachers.

Ms. Doherty stated that she was all for this motion. As she has stated before, she doesn't think we use our TV Studio at the high school to its full capacity.

4. (by John J. Leahy) – Request the Superintendent gives the Committee an update on snow removal around the district; seconded by Mr. Conway. APPROVED

Mr. Leahy stated that he puts this on the agenda every year. He wants to make sure our kids are safe. During the last snow storm, he heard that between the Reilly Elementary School and the Sullivan Middle School it was not properly plowed. He wanted a report from Brian Curley, Operations Manager.

## **SUBCOMMITTEES**

1. Curriculum Subcommittee - Report and Approval of the Minutes of Monday, January 3, 2011, by Connie A. Martin, Chair.

Ms. Martin stated that the topics for discussion were:

### *Turnaround Plan Review*

Ms. Martin thanked Jim Neary, Coordinator School Improvement and Accountability, for typing up the minutes of her subcommittee meeting. The School Committee has until January 13, 2011 to appeal to the Commissioner of Education, Mitchell D. Chester, with concerns regarding the Lowell/Murkland Turnaround Plan. The key elements are that there have been some shifts in the schedule for the day including a 10-minute window in the morning (children are allowed to come in 10-minutes early). There have been changes in recess duties, which will release teachers for some additional:

- professional development
- common planning time
- activities.

There has been a true increase of 15-minutes per the day, which is specifically part of this Turnaround endeavor. We did have significant conversations regarding a partnership with Community Teamwork, Inc. In terms of full disclosure, "*I do work for Community Teamwork, Inc. I do not work with this aspect of the agency, but I do work there.*" There were some conversations about an additional preschool classroom, which will be part of this Turnaround working with Community Teamwork, Inc.; and, specifically, with their Headstart programming, which (in her bias opinion) is an extraordinary program for students who come in:

- with language deficit
- challenging economic circumstances

The Headstart Program has proven itself over decades to dramatically improve the educational performance of children over a lifetime by catching them at this young age and really surrounding them with not just academic support, but (she thinks probably more importantly):

- social and family support
  - to truly make them successful

To move forward, she wants the Committee to be aware of the need to develop some policies around this. Even more strongly, she recommends they start this. She knows the Superintendent was amiable to this. She thinks the Committee needs to be careful in the way they craft these policies in terms that we have certain requirements we need to meet, eligibility standards for these students to be able to be part of this program. She thinks the Committee is going to have to be cognizant of that in terms of selecting a subset of students and not giving access to all of our students. *“That is going to be the challenge.”* She wanted to communicate that to the Superintendent here so it can be part of the record, and to take that into consideration as we move forward. A lot of the Turnaround does focus, particularly in the first couple of years, work with teachers and giving them additional support. Some:

- aggressive opportunities
- working towards raising the bar
- raising the expectations
  - for the students who attend the Murkland Elementary School
  - our teaching staff as well

There were ongoing statements regarding the professional development work. It is specifically being used at the Murkland Elementary School with Teachers for Teachers Consultants. We discussed that in very passionate, committed ways last night. We intend to discuss that over and over again. She thinks the Turnaround Team and particularly the staff at the Murkland are very committed. She respects and appreciates that. She has stated this and she will say it as we go along, *“I do not support that aspect of the plan!”* It is important to note before this is submitted to recognize that the natural contract will come before this Committee for next year as we go through this process. As I said last night and before this Committee, *“I will be voting against that as well.”* She wanted everyone to be aware of that situation as we look at what the Turnaround means and what it is suppose to do for the school. We discussed some of the truly, dramatic changes they are talking about. She is supportive, but she has some concern. One of the specific things that was discussed and it has been discussed publicly by our state government and a couple of different venues, the real interest of extending the school day as one of the priorities. She has concern when she returns this document to DESE (Department of Elementary and Secondary Education) for consideration. That might be the thing they feel we have not gone far enough with. It is difficult to say when we don't have anything to compare ourselves with. The Superintendent and she have been working to try and find some of those comparisons with some of the other districts who are in the exact same circumstance. We don't have a full slate to make those comparisons to, to see if we are in a reasonable range or if we need to stretch further. It is difficult when she knows the 13<sup>th</sup> (of January) is the deadline for this. That is going to be a challenge. If we submit this, we should be prepared for some additional pushback and changes. *“I do have great respect for the educators that joined us last night. Their commitment and tenacity, and their vision of the school they are trying to build will do their students proud! That is no small feat. It is a work in progress.”*

Ms. Martin asked the Superintendent if the document had to be look at, revised, and sent to the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education by the 13<sup>th</sup> of January.

Dr. Chris A. Scott, Superintendent, stated that when we sent in our Turnaround Plan, then they made suggestions on the Turnaround Plan, and that was our response to their suggestions. *“It is somewhat convoluted, but it is a fairly long process. The question, Ms. Martin, that you brought up at the meeting that the team didn’t have an answer for, because it hasn’t been conveyed to us at this point.”* Two things:

- (1) Do we hear back?
- (2) When do we hear back on our response to their response?

That is the Turnaround Plan which is like the foundation, the base, the basement that you build your Redesign Plan on. The Redesign Plan is the one that has been changed. It was the middle of the month. You did have that correct. At one point it was the 13<sup>th</sup> (of January). Now it is pushed out for two more weeks past that. *“I do have a meeting this Friday with members of the Department of Ed, Urban Superintendent’s Meeting. These questions may be asked that came up at that meeting although it is not on the agenda. At this point in time with your other concern, which I know the Committee is concerned (I am concerned as well), to the issue of time. In the feedback we got from the state, from the DESE, on the Turnaround Plan, they want us to clarify minutes in their day to the extent that we were extending our day. My response to that was, how many minutes are you looking for? What is the benchmark so we can go back to our union and negotiate that? She did speak with the Deputy Commissioner. She said that they didn’t have a number of minutes, but DESE ( Department of Elementary and Secondary Education) would work to get the other proposals the other districts are working on so we could see, supposedly, who we were competing against, that benchmark.”* She has asked for an update on that. At this time, it hasn’t been provided. She believes it is more complicated, perhaps, when you look at all the breakdowns of the day. She then asked Paul Georges, President of the United Teachers of Lowell (UTL) to contact other unions and see what they had negotiated so we could have some basis to extend our day. *“At least we can show that we attempted to address that issue.”* That information came back, incomplete at best. In some cities and towns there were extended days. In others there weren’t. The cities that didn’t say a longer day, maybe they started with a longer day than Lowell did, because they had to or maybe a district did extend their time more than us. With the case in Boston, they started with less time than us. *“Until you see this all in front of you, you feel like you have blinders on trying to answer a riddle. It is something that is still out there for us.”*

Ms. Martin, *“Will the Redesign Plan come before us, the Committee or the Subcommittee (on Curriculum and Instruction)?”*

Dr. Chris A. Scott, Superintendent stated that her understanding of the next steps of the Redesign is by this Friday. Jim Neary mentioned that it would be sent out to the state co group. They would see it, and we would have it on the agenda as well for the next School Committee meeting. *“I think Ms. Martin to be more thorough than that, what I have just said is to the regulations we are following. I think it would be prudent for us just to be thorough; it does not appear through regulations that we need a vote of the School Committee for the Redesign Plan, which is odd to me, because we needed it for the*

*Turnaround Plan. Again, I will clarify on Friday. Regardless if I need a vote or not, I would be more comfortable if you were willing to call another subcommittee meeting a week or so before it is due in so we can have some time with it to answer any further questions that you have.”* She wanted the meeting after she meets with the stakeholders group.

Ms. Martin wanted the meeting set up the Monday or Tuesday on the week of the scheduled School Committee meeting.

Ms. Doherty stated that she had a couple of points she wanted to make. She thanked and appreciated the work the Murkland staff has done. The saying in her family is, “*When things get tough, the tough get going.*” The teachers at the Murkland Elementary School, knowing it was under scrutiny, accountability, and the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education looking down their shoulders, choose to stay. “*Out of all that staff, only three chose to leave, because they are committed and caring people.*” She also wanted to state her appreciation to the new leadership at that school. They were willing to step up to the plate knowing what was at stake. She wanted to start with that, because she does have some concerns that she also wants to go into. “*I want that framework out there that I am very much aware of their commitment to the education of our children.*” However, in terms of the Turnaround Plan, she has concerns particularly with the consultants. “*I have concerns about THAT piece of the Turnaround Plan, but I am willing to support the plan overall.*” Her understanding is that, the School Committee, has until the middle of January to express these concerns in writing to the Commissioner of Education. “*I’m not suggesting that we do that now. I don’t want to do that now. I want us to be a unified front working towards getting that \$500,000 grant that we will be competing for. I have concerns about this piece of the Turnaround Plan, but I am also willing to support it, because I do see it as a work in progress. Right within the language of the plan, it talks extensively about constant use of data and benchmarks to assess how successful the plan is. That is really where I expect the Committee will be involved. From the Superintendent’s comments, she expects us to be involved as well not only just when you get the Redesign Plan.*” When you look at those benchmarks, Fountas and Pinnell assessment, where the students are moving in terms of grade- level reading, how are we progressing with the goals that we set? Again, she has concerns about the consultants, which she brought up back in November, when she discovered they were part of the plan. “*Nothing against these particular consultants. I have no doubt that they do good work. The points I have said from the beginning still remain for me. We do balanced literacy already in the district. We have the expertise. We should be building on that expertise in a way that it is going to have a meaningful expansion component as opposed to a consultant that comes in for 48 days, at 14 hundred dollars a day, and then leaves. I am concerned that the Redesign Plan is based on what the Turnaround Plan is saying. Follow that out for another three years. This is our third year with these consultants which really have been in only one or two schools.*” As an example, at the subcommittee meeting on Monday night, we talked about what we did with the math initiative. She was newly onboard when that happened. “*I know the district invested a million dollars upfront.*” \$900,000 of it was on the curriculum. “*We didn’t have a consistent math curriculum throughout the district. She believes in the first year we spent*

*about one hundred thousand dollars in consultants. We had people in the district training all our Math Teachers by grade-level. That is when we developed math resource teachers and coaches, because we were building capacity. She has heard and has listened very carefully to the principal, our new leadership at the Murkland Elementary School (Jason DiCarlo) and his concerns. "This staff has been through the wringer. They really have, and they are committed to student's success. They are there, they are doing the work, and they are comfortable with these consultants! I hear that, but we are in a different fiscal climate then we were even in 2005. We spent the one hundred thousand to roll out this whole-new-way of teaching math. This balanced-literacy thing is not a whole-new-way of teaching reading." It is a way we have been doing, and we are doing throughout the district. I am not going to belabor that point except to say that I am going to be looking for those benchmarks to show we are making the kind of progress we need to make. When that vote comes up, regardless of our role in the Redesign Plan, we have to vote on the spending of the money. She is not going to sit here and say that it is an absolute no for her for the consultants. "I am not convinced that this is the right road for us to go on. It is an expensive road, and I don't think we are getting the full bang for the buck. The last point in terms of my concerns (and this really speaks more to the process and the timing in the way this rolled out in regards to these particular consultants) is that I was not aware until the vote came to us in November that they were part of the plan. It is in here. There are two paragraphs where they are mentioned. I read the document and I try to stay focused on every detail. It is pretty dense. As my colleague said, they have done a huge amount of work in looking how we're going to turn this school around. I felt that the information came to me on the blind side. I did have a conversation about this with the Superintendent, which I will share with the rest of the Committee. Not only because we had voted in the spring very clearly that we couldn't afford these consultants anymore at 14 hundred dollars a day when we were laying off:*

- *all the librarians*
- *25 paraprofessionals at the elementary level, and*
- *all those things (technology instructors, custodians, etc.)*

*The message was very clear in the spring. I was surprised when it came up on the floor. I asked for clarification. The Superintendent told us that we were required to use consultants. I found out after we got the actual grant documentation regulations (in fact one grant did require that you not use it for salary), the other grant would have allowed us to use it for salary. I felt that there was misleading information. The final straw for me was that they (the consultants) had already started in the district. The next meeting, which was our first December meeting (regular School Committee meeting of December 1, 2010, page 5 last paragraph), I voted to fund that contract, because they had already begun the work. I wasn't comfortable with the process and the timing to fund that contract. That concern still remains with me." Going forward, it sounds like the Superintendent wants to keep the Committee in the timeline. Again, Ms. Doherty reiterated that she has concerns regarding:*

- *consultants being in the district*
  - *the Committee not being informed*

- consultants working without a contract,
  - the Committee not being informed.

Again, she reiterated that she was supporting the plan. *“I will be looking very closely at evidence that we are really getting what we need from these consultants.”*

Ms. Laraba, *“I also have to say that I am appreciative of the work the staff has put into doing the Turnaround Plan and the amount of time and energy put into this. It certainly has not been an easy process for them. I don’t envy the stress and conditions they are under because of this. I do have to take some issue to some of the comments made, especially, Teachers for Teachers, because this obviously has been an ongoing conversation. I did not have that same clarity that we said to the Superintendent not to use these consultants, because they were too expensive. I remember the conversation being that there were concerns that they were expensive. In fact, I went back and read the report on the use of consultants and then I read the meeting minutes. It does not say in there that we expressly said do not use these consultants. What it does say is that there are concerns about the costs for them. I want to get that out there, because it kind of sounds like people did something that they weren’t suppose to do or were especially told not to do. I don’t feel that is the case at all. In terms of us approving a contract for people that have already started working; again, revealing other minutes, we have done that before. We have had people in place working, and we have approved the expenditure just for their contract after they had started. So that is not something that was unusual in this case, and, again, that’s something else that I thought we needed to clarify. In terms of Teachers for Teachers themselves, we put a group of people together with the task of coming up with a Turnaround Plan and a Redesign Plan for this level 4 school, a process that they did not take lightly. They put a lot of time and energy into it. In their opinion in dealing with the school and the people involved, this would be a program very beneficial to them. While we are not in the financial climate that we have been in the past, I think it also has to be underscored that this is grant money. This is not money coming out of our bottom-line. That’s not to say that we shouldn’t scrutinize how grant money is being spent, but I don’t want people to have the impression that this money is in lieu of teachers at the high school or at the schools any place else. This is specifically processed for a specific school. We have taken so much away from our teachers and cut so much from them from our budget that my personal opinion is: We have teachers that are:*

- *asking for this program.*
- *are supportive of this program*
- *have data that shows visual results with this program.*

*This is such a small part of the entire Turnaround Plan and Redesign Plan, and the amount of attention we have given, it is really out of proportion with everything else that is going on in these plans. If you read these plans, and, again, they are dense reading, you see what they are going through to try to bring us where we need to be. Again, not to minimize the cost or anything else, this is a very small part of the plan that we are getting hung up on. We really need to focus on the bigger picture. When we’re looking at trying to support the school and trying to support the teachers, I think it is important that we listen to them, we*

*hear them, and we support them. The other comment I wanted to make is really about the timing of this. This is a lot of work that is being done in a short amount of time. We had a meeting I was able to attend, and it was a two and a half hour meeting. I thank the team and the Superintendent, Mr. Neary and the Committee members, for putting the time and energy on a Monday night. To me, this is showing their level of dedication to the process that they are willing to come out to say:*

- *this is what we're willing to do*
- *this is what we want to do*

*I just think we have to be careful not to get hung up on a small part of the entire process. It is:*

- *a huge process*
- *an ongoing process*

*We got:*

- *three years going forward for this*
  - *we need to keep an eye on that*

*One of Ms. Martin's concerns about extending the day and how much in terms of comparison to other schools, we don't have that information. We've tried to get that information. I think for our purposes we need to focus on, yes, we said an extra 15 minutes, but how are we getting the biggest bang for our time there? The fact that the Murkland Team has redone their schedule to cut down on transition time, which may not sound like a lot, but when you think about kids:*

- *walking in a room*
- *sitting down*
- *getting settled*
- *starting a lesson*
- *the uproar*
- *and everything else*

*It is a huge bonus for them. The redirecting the time so teachers have the recess is huge to me. I think rather than sit there and worry about what everyone else is doing, we should really focus on the fact that we've got the plan here. I think it is a very good plan. It shows that there was a lot of time and energy going through. If it comes down the pike that the state wanted us to say how and more, then shame on the state, because they haven't told us that kind of information. If we are really going to talk about changing the school culture (this won't make me popular with any student at all), I really think we should be thinking of extending the school year. It is a long day as it is. To try to add an hour or an hour and a half on it, to me would be harsh. If we could reconfigure the year and add more days to the year, I think that would be much more beneficial to our students. I would like to see us make progress on that, but imagine that is more of a legislature issue that we need to talk to our*

*legislative body. If we are really going to talk about the school, the culture and everything else; cutting down on a 10-week span where kids are losing the knowledge that they had. A big chunk of the fall recouping that to me would be a better way to extend the time.” She thanked the Mayor for letting her go on.*

Mr. Leary stated that the bullet point here:

- the extended hours for summer school

If we could make it mandatory, it would be right to his colleague’s goal, which he thinks is right on target. Extending time during the day is probably not as meaningful as the duration throughout the year. *“Be it as it may, I want to thank the entire Subcommittee (Curriculum and Instruction Subcommittee), the administration, and especially Principal DiCarlo and his staff at the Murkland. I met with Jason prior to the holidays. He took the timeout to meet with me and walked me around. He really gave me his feedback in terms of what was:*

- *important to him*
- *his hopes of reaching these benchmarks*
  - *everybody is trying to achieve*

*This guy is a good guy and we’ve got to keep people like him in our system. There are a lot of good principals out there, and he’s one of them. What Mr. DiCarlo did point out is he thinks this plan will achieve the benchmarks. As my colleagues have already stated, that’s the proof in the pudding. Ms. Doherty said it bluntly, I’m going to wait to see if we reach these benchmarks or not. If we don’t hit the benchmarks, then that’s where the issue is. As far as the work involved, a tremendous amount of work! The folks in here have done an excellent job working hard. Now the question is again: Are they going to meet the goals they are accountable to. As far as the Department of Education and I have said it at the last meeting, it is pick an adjective: bizarre, ridiculous! I don’t know why we are competing for money. Nobody knows what we are competing for. The Department of Education doesn’t give a heck of a lot of feedback in that area. Enough said about that. I just think it’s perverse! How’s that adjective? In terms that we are all competing for money, if three of these districts fail after putting good plans together and don’t get the money, what does that mean for those schools? They continue to fail? A rhetorical question I guess. Regarding the consultant issue, I’m a consultant. I think a consultant’s experience is highly valuable; often more valuable than certain aspects of what some of the staff can deliver. I think the ultimate point there is; we’re only using them in two or three elementary schools. We have all these other schools that we need to have the same services implemented or ensuring that we have those services implemented. I read through the report and I think the union President Paul Georges (of the United Teachers of Lowell) had something, ‘Train the Trainer’. Obviously, with copyright issue, etc. that might be a problem utilizing the consultants in that fashion. Being with technology, we should be looking at utilizing, training our folks online. A motion we just passed. I know that is oversimplifying what everybody has been talking about for the past year regarding consultants and the cost of consultants. Even if we hired one staff member, we’re not going to be able to reach the entire school population in all of our schools. We need to find creative ways of reaching*

*our staff with the information so they can go out there and deliver the services to the students. We're going to have budget cuts. We're going to have massive budget cuts. We still have to be student driven. It is going to be painful, because we are going to be laying-off human beings. We've got to look at new ways of reaching folks with professional development. 'Train the Trainer!' What does that really mean? We've got to get moving in these areas and implementing it. Again, I want to end by thanking everybody:*

- *for their hard work*
- *very committed*

*As long as we hit our benchmarks, then I think we are okay. If we don't hit our benchmarks, that's when we have to take a look at whether:*

- *15 minutes additional time during the day is appropriate*
- *all the development that we were focused on was of high value*

One more thing that he didn't see in the report was the money we're spending to actually teach parents how to read in this district. He has heard a little bit about it. The parents don't have the skill sets to help, to teach their kids at home. He knows we are putting aside a certain amount of these monies to actually have an adult ed for some of the parents so they can actually read to their kids. He wanted to know if anyone could comment on that. He knows that point doesn't get hit a lot, because he knows there is a lot of important work at a higher level. *"I think we are doing some good stuff at the Murkland. There is a question if they will reach the benchmarks that are out there."*

Ms. Martin, *"Just a couple of quick responses. As I said earlier in my report, we do tend to go around and around on this. I just want to be clear on a couple points. One is grant money. Grant money in this particular case, in every case, but in this particular case has been granted to this school because of its profound need. It is not:*

- *extra money*
- *or free money*
- *or fun money*

*What it is:*

*It has been directed at a school that is in desperate need of additional supports and doesn't require less attention from us; it requires more. It doesn't have less of a responsibility attached to it, because it has grant money directed at a specific school; it has more responsibility. Every dollar you are spending from a grant has specific direction attached to it. It is our judiciary responsibility to ensure that we make those decisions with very careful and close review. The idea of discounting grant money as something less than or different than is not a true understanding of what grant money is meant to do in this environment. In terms of the smallness of this issue (in some ways I can't help but agree) that the contracts that these individuals are being paid from was, correct me if I am wrong Madam Superintendent, was one hundred and forty thousand dollars for this current year."*

Dr. Chris A. Scott, Superintendent, *“That was the total budget.”*

Ms. Martin, *“So fifty percent. That is not small. Fifty percent of the money that was allocated to help this desperately; drowning school was spent for this particular purchase. We can debate all day long if it was worth it, and that is great. Ultimately, the decisions we have to make are based on:*

- *if it was the best way to spend this money*
- *the most effective way*
- *the biggest bang that we could possible get for students*
  - *who were in desperate need of this support*
    - ✓ *from their teachers and*
    - ✓ *from the district that is responsible for them.*

*The final thing I want to ask is that and I think that you casually mentioned that this is the common practice in the Lowell Public Schools. We have people working we don't have signed contracts with. If that is the case, I'd like a list of those immediately if possible. Moving forward, that is illegal! It is not the appropriate way to do business. People cannot be expected to be paid from a Committee if they do not have a signed contract. They do not get a signed contract from any other entity but this Committee. Anything over five thousand dollars that is being instituted without our approval is not being done appropriately. As I said, it was kind of casually mentioned. That's a huge issue! I don't know where that information came from, but I'd like to be privy to it as well. If one member is, it would be appropriate for us all to be aware of it. That is a big issue so as soon as we can get that information, the better. Again, maybe it is just something you're aware of and I'm not, or if we need to follow up on, that would be appropriate.”*

Ms. Doherty, *“I have just one additional question since you're throwing out quests. It might not be something you know off the top of your head so you can get it to us. How many people do we have currently employed with us who are on grants? Just a ballpark number; do we know that? I know in the past it was more. We've lost a lot of grant money. Through you to Mr. Lang if there is a general idea of how many people are on grants?”*

Roger (Jay) Lang IV, Assistant Superintendent of Finance and Operations, *“Real ballpark, we have about nineteen hundred and fifty employees. I'm going to estimate maybe three hundred are probably grant employees. It is a breakdown. I can get it for you in the morning. Off the top of my head, maybe 19 hundred and fifty total, maybe 300 are on grants.”*

Ms. Doherty, *“Even given the cuts we have seen in grant money over the last few years THAT federal grant money has gone down. We've seen a lot of cuts. We're still employing over 300 people on grant money. The grants are something we depend on in terms of being able to support our programs.”*

Ms. Laraba, *“Just to respond to Committeewoman Martin’s question, this isn’t information that I have received from anyone other than looking at our minutes. The two that come to mind, specifically, would be the principals we signed or approved the money for: Lee (Linda Lee Principal of the Shaughnessy School) and Manolopoulos (William Manolopoulos, Principal of the JG Pyne Arts School). That wasn’t any information that somebody gave me. I was flipping through various minutes to see what our practice has been. Those were the two that stood out to me most recently. That’s not to say that is long-standing, but I’m saying in researching our conversation and looking what was done, that’s what I found.”*

Ms. Martin, *“Just to be clear though, those two situations that were discussed specifically on this floor were unique. We had a very clear discussion that it was because the Retirement Board wouldn’t allow us to enter into those contracts until they had given us the approval. Those are unique situations that were specifically described to us that way”*

Ms. Laraba, *“Those were unique but my point was that we had discussed Teachers for Teachers as part of this process, the Turnaround Plan, and using them within the school, because it had been a program that was in place and wanted to be continued. That is where I was going with that. We had already had conversations about Teachers for Teachers, specifically, so it was not a surprise to me that they were on there. I’m not clear why it was a surprise for other people.”*

Ms. Martin, *“It was a surprise for me. I will be quite frank. It was absolutely a surprise for me. It was a surprise for me at the conclusion that as Ms. Doherty has mentioned during our spring conversations about the expense associated with this investment. I think that moving forward (and it was expressed rather clearly during that timeframe) that the price was very high. I think then September came. For whatever reason, this group began their work again, and it was three months before their contract came to us. I think a careful review of the minutes will show that in every other case contracts were approved beforehand like any other contractor that we use. The idea of someone doing this work with no expectation of payment for three months has not happened in the past. I think that was a purposeful move, and I think the minutes serve a very real purpose. I am certainly inspired now to go back and get the tapes from the public library, and I will be watching those so we can make those comparisons. I have a very strong memory certainly of my own clearly stressed concerns about this. I don’t think I left any question as an individual member of this Committee my feelings on this topic. I certainly do not recall being alone in that.*

Mayor Milinazzo stated that he was giving the Committee a lot of latitude here. He recognized Ms. Doherty.

Ms. Doherty, *“Just one quick point. I want to clarify something for my colleague. We had extensive subcommittee meetings that perhaps if my colleague to the left was looking at the minutes of our formal meeting, we did not go into the detail. As you know, we had a subcommittee meeting the other night, two and a half hours. Generally, the subcommittee discussions will be more extensive than what we say on the floor reporting out the minutes or even expressing our concerns. I think that you (Ms. Martin) and I were both at that*

*subcommittee meeting, we're on the Curriculum Subcommittee as was – I believe Mr. Leary was at that meeting. So perhaps you (Ms. Laraba) weren't there. I don't recall that piece. Certainly if it happened in subcommittee, and Ms. Laraba was only privy to the formal minutes of the actual meeting that level of detail would not be there. So it is understandable that she would not have that sense of clarity that those of us who were at that subcommittee do."*

Ms. Laraba, *"I do appreciate that Ms. Doherty. That could well be the case that discussion at a subcommittee. The point I was trying to make as a body this School Committee did not make a vote to say, 'Do not use these consultants.' They expressed concerns about the cost, but there's not a vote saying, 'Do not use these consultants.' Again, they're consultants with measurable results that have been part of the progress. As Mr. Leary said, we get to the point they're not making the benchmarks then that answers the question right there. We're not using them."*

Ms. Doherty stated that there was a vote as a full body.

Ms. Laraba ask if it was a full body.

Ms. Doherty responded in the affirmative.

Ms. Laraba stated that she did not find that record.

Dr. Chris A. Scott, Superintendent, *"I just need to clarify that the administration is not aware of a vote. In fact, if there was a vote on these consultants that would obviously be a big problem for me and a huge oversight, so we are not aware. We can definitely look into a vote. If in fact that is the case; that was missed by this administration; obviously, that is a big problem, and I would apologize for that. Another point Ms. Doherty that you brought up earlier that I would like to address and again apologize to you publicly since it was brought up in our conversation. just with regards to your concerns over me citing on the Permission to Enter form there were two different grants that were going to pay for the Bridge funding. I did reference that evening the new grant that was for consultants for improving our schools, and that was something new that the department have, and I apologize for any misunderstanding or that you felt in any way that my comments were misleading. As I said to you personally, I felt badly about that, because that's how you felt. That would never be my intent. I was just trying to clarify that there was a new grant, and specifically that was to be used for consultants. The other grant made no mention of that. I just want to be clear. Thank you!"*

Mr. Leary stated that he just had a quick question through the Mayor to the Superintendent, and he hoped to phrase it correctly. *"We were given a vote of the consultants. I think it was November or December; I can't remember when we had the vote. Maybe it was early December ( **For the record**, regular School Committee meeting of December 1, 2010, bottom of page 5, last paragraph). Were they already authorized to work, and we were doing ... from my understanding, we were voting on the contract for the work that had*

*already occurred. Was it not supposed to come forward in August prior to them beginning work?"*

Dr. Chris A. Scott, Superintendent, *"To Ms. Martin's point, it's best practice that the consultants should have their bills in before they do the work or the contract before to have a vote of the Committee. They do run the risk if the Committee votes no, that it's a legal right they won't get paid. This point has been made clear."*

Ms. Martin moved:

To accept the Curriculum Subcommittee report as a report of progress and to place on file; seconded by Mr. Conway. APPROVED

2. Technology Subcommittee - Report of the Meeting of Wednesday, January 5, 2011, by John J. Leahy

Mr. Leahy stated that his Technology Subcommittee met this evening prior to this regular meeting at six o'clock. There were eight items on the agenda. They weren't able to get to all of them. The first item on the agenda was:

*Molloy Alternative School* - Anybody at the Molloy Alternative School can now access the Lowell High School website.

*Virtual Classrooms Online* - The second agenda item was about the motion regarding virtual classrooms online. We did have more virtual classrooms online, but do to budget cuts, some are gone. We do have a couple of virtual classes online at Lowell High School with the University of Massachusetts Lowell. At present we do use a couple of Science Labs, biology classes, with virtual classrooms. We are looking ahead to see what we can offer for next year, and the best way to provide these services to students.

*Microsoft Lawsuit* - We had money that came in from the Microsoft lawsuit in the 2008-2009 Lowell School Department Budget. We received a report on that:

- how the money was spent.
- what purchases were made

*X-2 for Parent Access* – A motion was made by Mr. Leahy and himself for the Superintendent to provide the Technology Subcommittee with a plan to allow parent's access to the X-2 so they can access their students' records on:

- weekly home assignments
- grade curriculum information

Mr. Leahy stated that with the budget deficit we are now in, we still have to discuss this.

Mr. Leary concurred with Mr. Leahy. He stated that there are 10 outstanding motions relating to technology. Roger (Jay) Lang IV, Assistant Superintendent of Finance and Operations, is doing an updated survey on what the technology needs in our schools are. We cannot say we are providing the best education for our students without this technology. He further stated:

- We need to do it!
- We must do it!
- We will do it!

After the oral discussion, Mr. Leahy moved:

To accept the oral Technology Subcommittee report as a report of progress; seconded by Mr. Leary. APPROVED

## **REPORTS OF THE SUPERINTENDENT**

Dr. Chris A. Scott, Superintendent, presented and recommended approval of the following reports:

1. Personnel Report- Pursuant to Chapter 71 of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts Department of Education's Reform Act of 1993, the Personnel Office hereby informs the Committee of the retirements, resignations, and new hires since the last regular School Committee meeting of October 6, 2010.

Ms. Martin moved:

To accept the report as a report of progress and to place on file; seconded by Ms. Laraba. APPROVED

2. List of Eligible Teachers – Updated as of January 5, 2011

Ms. Doherty moved:

To accept the report as a report of progress and to place on file; seconded by Mr. Conway. APPROVED

## **NEW BUSINESS**

1. Acceptance of Gift to Lowell High School

This was a gift of a Records Board from the Friends of Lowell High School Girls and Boys Swim and Dive Teams for the purpose of donating it to the Swim and Dive Program at Lowell High School. Dr. Chris A. Scott, Superintendent, recommended approval.

Mr. Conway moved:

To accept the recommendation of the Superintendent to approve the gift of a Records Board from the Friends of Lowell High School Girls and Boys Swim and Dive Teams for the purpose of donating it to the Swim and Dive Program at Lowell High School ; seconded by Ms. Doherty. Unanimously approved on roll call. APPROVED

### CONVENTION/CONFERENCE REQUESTS

The Superintendent presented and recommended approval of the following convention/conference requests:

1. Field Trip Request: Fifty Lowell High School Hospitality Academy students, along with five staff members, to visit the *Lincoln Culinary Institute* in Hartford, CT on Monday, January 24, 2011. One Substitute teacher is needed and the cost of \$100 will be funded by Individual School Funds.
2. Field Trip Request: Lowell High School Cheerleader Team [28 students], along with Head Coach John Beaton and 5 chaperones, to travel to South Hadley and Ludlow, MA on Friday, February 11<sup>th</sup> through Sunday, February 13<sup>th</sup>, 2011 to participate in two *MSSAA Cheerleading Tournaments*. The Athletic Department budget will pay the entry fee of \$75. All other costs associated with the trip will be paid by the Friends of Lowell High School and through fundraising and donations. No substitute teacher is needed.
3. Claire Abrams, K-12 Mathematics Coordinator and Jeffrey Gwiazda, District Mathematics Support Specialist, to attend the *U. S. Department of Education's Mathematics and Science Partnerships Program Regional Conference* to be held on Monday, February 14<sup>th</sup> to Wednesday, February 16, 2011 in Baltimore, MD. EduTron Corporation will pay for all expenses. No substitute teachers are needed.

Mr. Conway moved:

To take all three convention/conference request together; seconded by Ms. Doherty.  
APPROVED

Ms. Martin moved:

To accept the recommendation of the Superintendent and to approve all three convention/conference requests; seconded by Ms. Laraba. Unanimously approved on roll call. APPROVED

**COMMUNICATION**

1. Lowell Telecommunication [Channel 10] Broadcast of School Committee Meetings:  
Live on the 1<sup>st</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> Wednesday of the Month; Thursdays @ 6PM; Saturday and Sundays @ 2PM; Tuesdays @ 10AM.

Ms. Martin moved:

To accept the communication and to place on file; seconded by Mr. Leary. APPROVED

**PROFESSIONAL PERSONNEL**

The Superintendent presented and recommended approval of the following request:

1. The Members of the United Teachers of Lowell (UTL) request permission to donate sick leave to:

<b>NAME:</b>	<b>SCHOOL/PROFESSION</b>	<b>NUMBER OF DAYS</b>
Gretchen Garvey	Lowell High School Teacher	6 days
Kerri Morales	Lowell High School Teacher	17 days
Laura Lafleur	Sullivan Middle School Teacher	7 days

Ms. Doherty moved:

To accept the recommendation of the Superintendent to **delay**; seconded by Mr. Leary. **Delay** APPROVED

**DIVISION OF PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION (Civil Service)**

1. Lowell SEIU Local 888 Clerical Union request to donate:

<b>NAME:</b>	<b>DEPARTMENT/PROFESSION</b>	<b>NUMBER OF DAYS</b>
Anita Verdi	Special Education/clerk	23 days

Mr. Conway moved:

To accept the recommendation of the Superintendent to approve; seconded by Ms. Martin. Unanimously approved on roll call. APPROVED

**ADJOURNMENT** – Ms. Doherty moved to adjourn; seconded by Ms. Martin. This meeting adjourned at 8:54 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Dr. Chris A. Scott, Superintendent and  
Secretary to the Lowell School Committee

CAS: jms

Enclosures