APPROVED

Lawrence Family Development Charter School

Minutes

LFDCS Board of Trustees Meeting

Date and Time
Wednesday October 14, 2026 at 5:30 PM

Location
Zoom

Join Zoom Meeting
https://zoom.us/j/94440035486?pwd=a9JHK4GLqrDDjDXdgEfk20MiPdMKy1.1

Meeting ID: 944 4003 5486
Passcode: L9QXS5

One tap mobile
+16465588656,,94440035486#,,,,*341965# US (New York)
+16469313860,,94440035486#,,,,*341965# US

Trustees Present
C. Needham (remote), D. DeFillippo (remote), G. Lopez (remote), J. Cedeno (remote), J. Henriquez (remote), R. Almanzar (remote)

Trustees Absent
E. Nolberto, L. Perez

Trustees who arrived after the meeting opened
R. Almanzar

Trustees who left before the meeting adjourned

C. Needham, J. Henriquez

Guests Present
A. Croes (remote), Arlene Garcia (remote), C. Parcell (remote), D. Thakkar (remote), H. Castleman (remote), L. Lawler (remote), M. Denu (remote), M. Ventre (remote), N. Arpin (remote), Nicole Dean-Ward (remote), S. Stukuls (remote), Tony Schumann (remote), Y. Rodriguez (remote)

I. Opening Items

A. Record Attendance

B. Call the Meeting to Order

G. Lopez called a meeting of the board of trustees of Lawrence Family Development Charter School to order on Wednesday Oct 14, 2026 at 5:36 PM.

C. Pledge of Allegiance

D. Approve Minutes from the September 9, 2026 Meeting.

Chris N. suggested an edit to Section 10. A regarding the vote on Candidate #3.
C. Needham made a motion to approve the minutes from LFDCS Board of Trustees Meeting on 09-09-26.
J. Henriquez seconded the motion.
The board **VOTED** to approve the motion.

Roll Call

D. DeFillippo	Aye
C. Needham	Aye
G. Lopez	Aye
E. Nolberto	Absent
R. Almanzar	Absent
J. Cedeno	Aye
L. Perez	Absent
J. Henriquez	Aye

II. Finance Department

A. FY 26 Audit Report

Mark V. provided an update on the FY2026 audit timeline and explained that AAF had completed its fieldwork and submitted a draft of the financial statements, which was included in the Board package. Although the audit was expected to be approved at this meeting, its final completion is delayed because the Federal Office of Management and Budget has not yet released the compliance supplement required for auditors to conduct

single audits under Uniform Guidance. This requirement applies to LFDCS's food service program, which receives more than $1 million in federal funding. AAF has completed the financial portion of the audit, but it cannot finalize the single audit until the federal government issues the remaining compliance guidance.

Darshan T. explained that a single audit combines two components. A financial audit, which reviews the organization's financial compliance, and a compliance audit, which determines whether the organization has met the requirements of its federal grants. The financial portion has been completed, and the remaining step is for the auditors to review the food service program against the final federal compliance instructions. The audit is substantially complete and that the delay is related to the outstanding federal guidance rather than an identified compliance issue.

Mark V. explained that DESE issued guidance requiring all audit reports to be approved by October 30, 2026, and submitted by November 13, 2026, regardless of whether the federal compliance supplement has been released. To meet these deadlines, DESE has authorized Finance Committees at schools subject to a single audit to approve their audit reports on behalf of their respective Boards. Therefore, Mark V. is asking the Board to authorize the Finance Committee to hold a special meeting to carry out this process.
C. Needham made a motion to the Board to authorize the Finance Committee to hold a special meeting at a date and time set by the Committee's co-chairs, to review the final audit report for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2026, and to accept the report on behalf of the Board, provided that the Committee acts on or before 4:00 pm on October 30, 2026. The Finance Committee's acceptance of the audit report shall have the same effect as acceptance by the Board. The Chief Financial Officer is authorized to submit the final audit report approved by the Finance Committee to Dese by November 13, 2026.
D. DeFillippo seconded the motion.
The board **VOTED** to approve the motion.

Roll Call

D. DeFillippo	Aye
J. Henriquez	Aye
L. Perez	Absent
J. Cedeno	Aye
C. Needham	Aye
E. Nolberto	Absent
G. Lopez	Aye
R. Almanzar	Absent

B. BOT Resolutions drafted by Wagner Law Group

Mark V. provided an update on the school's 403(b) retirement savings plan. TrueStage, the school's retirement plan administrator and investment provider, experienced a cybersecurity incident on July 11, 2026. By July 13, its internal and external systems had been shut down, significantly disrupting plan services and preventing employees and service representatives from accessing individual accounts. Although account access

was restored this week, the extent of any potential disclosure of employees' personal information remains unknown.

Employee retirement account balances were not affected because the funds were held by Matrix Trust, a separate custodian from TrueStage, and remained invested according to participants' individual elections. However, payroll contributions withheld since the incident were deposited into a temporary account opened at Rockland Trust in the retirement plan's name. These contributions, totaling approximately $100,000 year-to-date, were not invested in the market during that period, resulting in potential lost investment earnings for participants.

The school retained Wagner Law Group, a firm specializing in retirement plans, on K & B's recommendation. The firm represents the school in its demands and potential claims against TrueStage and advises on establishing a replacement retirement plan. The school has sent demand notices to TrueStage and Good Harbor Investments, its local sales representative, and filed a claim with Hanover Insurance under the school's cybersecurity policy to seek recovery of legal expenses and any potential damages.

Mark V. reported that the school explored replacement plan providers, including Fidelity, Ascensus/ Vanguard. Although Fidelity was the school's first choice because of its local investment centers, it only accepts new plans with assets exceeding $20 million. The school's plan has approximately $6 million. The school is therefore moving forward with Ascensus/Vanguard. Wagner Law Group has experience working with both providers and recommended this arrangement, which is expected to offer comparable investment options at significantly more competitive rates than those previously charged by TrueStage and Good Harbor Investments. The school anticipates completing the transfer of plan assets from TrueStage to Ascensus for investment in Vanguard funds by December 31, 2026, when administratively feasible.

Chris N. asked whether employees were expected to experience any financial losses. Mark V. reiterated that existing account balances remained intact and that the only anticipated financial impact involved the lost investment earnings on the approximately $100,000 in payroll deductions held at Rockland Trust and not invested during the disruption**.** Mark V. shared the possibility that employees' personal information may have been exposed, although TrueStage had not confirmed this.

Mark V. explained that the school was advised by Wagner Law Group to let TrueStage and Matrix Trust provide employees with information regarding any potential data disclosures to avoid making representations on their behalf.

Chris N. also asked whether employees had received official communication about the incident. Mark V. stated that employees had received direct communications from TrueStage, including information confirming that account balances remained unaffected and that account access had been restored. Darshan T. added that TrueStage had

posted information on its website indicating that a forensic auditor had reviewed the incident and determined there was no active threat. Mark V. noted that TrueStage had also sent hard-copy notices directly to employees' homes. The school plans to communicate its decision to transition to Vanguard once the Board authorizes the proposed resolution and will focus on implementing the new retirement plan moving forward.
C. Needham made a motion to adopt the resolutions of the Board of Trustees of LFDCS regarding the Lawrence Family Development Retirement Savings Plan, as presented.
D. DeFillippo seconded the motion.
The board **VOTED** to approve the motion.

Roll Call

J. Cedeno	Aye
G. Lopez	Aye
L. Perez	Absent
R. Almanzar	Absent
E. Nolberto	Absent
D. DeFillippo	Aye
C. Needham	Aye
J. Henriquez	Aye

C. Contract with QPD for Advising on Campus Acquisition

Mark V. presented the QPD Real Estate Advisory Agreement, explaining that the school's goal is to acquire its campus within the next 18 months. QPD specializes in managing property acquisitions, financing, and construction projects for charter schools. QPD's original proposal was reviewed and restructured into three phases, each with its own scope of work, fee structure, and authorization. The Finance Committee reviewed the agreement and voted on September 2, 2026, to recommend its approval by the Board.

Phase One will focus on negotiating the purchase price, conducting due diligence, assessing the school's borrowing capacity, preparing a lender package and request for proposals for financing, and obtaining a property valuation. The valuation is targeted for completion by March 31, 2027. Phases Two and Three will address construction and potential campus improvements. Mark V. emphasized that moving forward with these subsequent phases will depend on the school's borrowing capacity beyond the acquisition price, its ability to manage additional debt, and the availability of funding for renovations. The school will need to carefully evaluate its long-term financial obligations while considering necessary improvements to the four campus buildings, some of which have been overdue for several years.

The proposed agreement includes a monthly retainer of $4,500 and a $100,000 success fee payable at the closing of financing, with total fees capped at $150,000. Fees for subsequent phases will be negotiated separately and will depend on whether the school decides to proceed with construction and has sufficient funding to complete the improvements. If the school is unsuccessful in acquiring the campus, its financial

obligation to QPD would be limited to the monthly retainer, totaling $50,000 over the anticipated 18-month period, with no success fee due.

Mark V. also noted that QPD anticipates approximately $250,000 in third-party due diligence expenses for Phase One. He compared this estimate with a proposal received approximately one year earlier from Rimkus, which quoted $180,000 for three due diligence components and the development of a 10-year capital improvement plan.

Chris N. asked whether the agreement had been reviewed by the school's legal counsel. Mark V. confirmed that counsel had reviewed and provided edits to the agreement. He added that the Finance Committee reviewed the revised agreement, including the changes proposed by Elka Sachs, which QPD subsequently accepted.
C. Needham made a motion to approve the Real Estate Advisory Services agreement with QPD, LLC, as presented, and to authorize the CFO to execute the agreement on behalf of the school.
D. DeFillippo seconded the motion.
The board **VOTED** to approve the motion.

Roll Call

G. Lopez	Aye
J. Henriquez	Aye
L. Perez	Absent
D. DeFillippo	Aye
C. Needham	Aye
E. Nolberto	Absent
J. Cedeno	Aye
R. Almanzar	Absent

Chris N. expressed concern about the significant expenses associated with the campus acquisition process and asked whether the costs incurred for the transaction and financing could be included in the financing package. Mark V. explained that QPD indicated this was common practice, although it was not guaranteed. He noted that the school could capitalize these expenses and amortize them over the initial financing term, depending on the structure of the loan.
Chris N. asked about the school's financial exposure if the acquisition does not move forward. Mark V. clarified that the school's obligation to QPD would be limited to $50,000 in monthly retainer fees. However, additional expenses for third-party services, including appraisals, engineering, environmental assessments, and legal services, would also be incurred and would not provide the anticipated benefit if the transaction failed. Mark V. estimated that the total expenses could range from $500,000 to $600,000, including the school's legal fees and the lender's legal expenses. He anticipated that legal expenses alone could reach several hundred thousand dollars, based on the school's previous experience negotiating the lease.
Chris N. requested that the potential financial impact of an unsuccessful transaction be reviewed at the next Board meeting, particularly in conjunction with the draft audit and the school's liquidity position. Mark V. confirmed that the school was currently operating with

positive cash flow. Chris N. noted that the FY2026 audit reflected a cash balance of approximately $6.4 million as of June 30, 2026. Mark V. clarified that this amount did not include approximately $1.7 million in tuition reimbursements from DESE that were received on July 2, 2026, due to an administrative delay. These funds had been recorded as accounts receivable in the audit. Therefore, the school's actual cash position at year-end was closer to $8.1 million.
Mark V. acknowledged that the acquisition process could involve approximately $500,000 in expenses and related financial risk. However, he emphasized the potential long-term financial benefits of purchasing the campus rather than continuing to lease the properties from the Fund. The school currently pays approximately $2.2 million annually in rent and could potentially save between $1 million and $1.2 million per year through ownership. He also noted that purchasing the campus would provide more predictable long-term costs, whereas the current lease includes annual rent increases of 3% for the first five years, with future increases yet to be determined.
Dave D. acknowledged that an acquisition of this size involves financial risk but emphasized that the potential benefits could extend for decades. He stated that although an unsuccessful transaction would have a financial impact, he believed the school's financial position was strong enough to undertake the risk while considering the long-term advantages of owning and improving the campus.

Mark V. assured the Board that QPD's progress would be monitored closely, with the Board involved and the Finance Committee overseeing the process, particularly the negotiations with the Fund and the property valuation. He explained that the school expected to have a better understanding of the likelihood of completing the acquisition before committing to the full estimated $500,000 in expenses. Darshan T. added that the estimated investment could potentially be recovered within five to six months through savings from mortgage payments compared with continued rent payments. Chris N. agreed that, considering the school's liquidity position, the risk was not excessive and emphasized the importance of moving forward with purchasing and improving the campus. Mark V. noted that the Board would receive additional information regarding the audit and financial position at an upcoming meeting.

Darshan T. provided an update on the Fund's recent campus visit with its evaluator. The evaluator visited the Lower School and Upper School buildings for approximately 45 minutes but did not visit the Academy buildings. The visit took place when students were not in the buildings and was believed to be part of the Fund's preliminary property valuation process. Chris N. noted that, under the terms of the lease, a third-party valuation would be obtained and considered as part of the acquisition negotiations, along with the school's valuation.

Mark V. also discussed current economic conditions and their potential impact on the transaction. He noted that rising interest rates have reduced competition for the campus, although they could result in higher borrowing costs for the school. QPD indicated that if the property were not used as a school, it could potentially be redeveloped into

apartments, which would likely result in a lower valuation than the amount the school is prepared to pay.

Dave D. asked whether the March 31, 2027, target date referenced in the QPD resolution was realistic. Mark V. clarified that this date represents the target for completing the school's valuation, not the closing date for the acquisition. The overall process is expected to take approximately 18 months, beginning in the fourth quarter of 2026, with a target closing date of March 31, 2028. He explained that negotiations with the Fund over the property's valuation could take approximately nine months. The process will involve the school and the Fund obtaining separate valuations. If the Fund does not accept the school's valuation, the two appraisers will attempt to reconcile the differences. If they cannot reach an agreement, they will jointly select a third appraiser whose valuation will be binding.

Chris N. also shared that he would be leaving the Board in August and was working closely with Jose H. to ensure a successful transition of Finance Committee leadership.

III. Superintendent's Report

A. Superintendent’s updates on 403(b) account, West St. construction, scholarship payments, election day concerns

Darshan T. informed the Board that he had updates on four topics. TruStage, scholarships, the 34 West Street construction project, and Election Day.

Mark V. had already provided a comprehensive update, but Darshan T. wanted to share one additional item. He read the statement published on TruStage’s website concerning the independent forensic investigation. According to the statement, the independent investigator determined that TruStage’s operating environment had been cleaned and that there was no indication of an active threat. The investigator also found no indication that participant files had been accessed by the intruder. Darshan T. directed the Board to TruStage’s website for additional information about the recovery process. This addressed the Board’s earlier concerns about the possible disclosure of personal information.

Darshan T. provided an update on the scholarship payments managed by Lawrence Prospera/ The Fund. He reminded the Board that scholarship checks are expected to be issued by June 1 each year. However, by mid-August, the Fund had issued a few checks, despite claiming that all checks had been sent by the June 1 deadline. During that period, LFDCS continued receiving calls and emails from high schools and parents seeking information about the status of scholarship payments. When the school directed those inquiries to the Fund, the Fund initially stopped accepting calls from LFDCS and later stopped responding to communication.

Darshan T. explained that the delays had serious consequences for families. Some schools assessed late fees because tuition payments had not been received on time,

while others charged families the full tuition amount because the scholarship checks had not arrived. This created significant stress for families, particularly those whose children faced the possibility of having their admissions rescinded because of outstanding tuition balances. He stated that LFDCS had repeatedly attempted to work with the Fund but continued receiving excuses and assurances that the checks would be issued. By mid-September, several schools were still waiting for payments. Some checks arrived at the schools without signatures, causing further delays. Darshan T. noted that the situation had negatively affected the school's reputation with families and the high schools that work with LFDCS to enroll scholarship recipients.

Darshan T. reminded the Board that, at its previous meeting, members had voted to send a formal letter to the Fund's Board Chair. The letter, dated September 14, was signed by the LFDCS Board Chair and addressed the Fund's failure to meet its scholarship obligations. It requested an immediate resolution and disclosure of the relevant accounting records within 10 days, as required under the Public Records Law. More than 10 days had passed without a response or even acknowledgment of receipt from the Fund's Board of Directors. At this time, three schools were still waiting for scholarship checks. Darshan T. stated that the Fund remained in violation of its obligations and the trust placed in it by the school, families, and the public. Darshan T. asked the Board for guidance on how to proceed, given that the formal letter had been sent without any acknowledgment or response.

Mark V. raised concerns about whether the Fund might be commingling scholarship funds with other resources or using the money for other purposes while delaying payments to schools. He explained that the concern was whether the Fund intended to repay the money but might no longer have the financial ability to do so. Darshan T. explained that, when the payment delays first became apparent in mid-August, he contacted the donors directly. He stated that donors contribute with the expectation that their donations will reach the intended recipients on time. Since that was not happening, he wanted to use the donors' influence to encourage the Fund to issue the outstanding checks.

Two hours after contacting the donors, Darshan T. received a call from Dan Halloran, who was upset that the donors had been contacted and threatened legal action, but did not address the concerns about the delayed scholarship payments. Darshan T. stated that the donors subsequently directed the Fund to issue the payments, and the Fund sent additional checks shortly afterward. He questioned the Fund's claim that all checks had been sent by June 1, noting that additional checks were issued in July, August, and September. He stated that both claims could not be accurate and that the additional payments demonstrated that the checks had not all been issued by the required deadline. Darshan T. also emphasized that this was the second consecutive year in which similar delays had occurred. Although the Fund had assured LFDCS after the previous year's incident that the problem would not happen again, the same situation had occurred. He

expressed concern that the school could no longer rely on the Fund to safeguard and administer scholarship funds in future years.

Germinudy L. asked what steps could be taken to recover the scholarship money. She also referenced a recent city grant that had been awarded to the Fund. Darshan T. clarified that scholarship funds are supposed to be maintained in a separate account and should not be commingled with the Fund's other resources. He stated that LFDCS did not know whether the funds had been commingled but needed access to the records to determine how the money was being handled.
Chris N. asked what role the Massachusetts Attorney General's Office could play in addressing the Fund's failure to provide the requested information under the Public Records Law. Darshan T. explained that the Public Records Law generally requires the requested information to be provided within 10 days. However, the Attorney General's process allows up to 30 days before a complaint may be filed. Since the September 14 letter had been outstanding for 30 days without a response, LFDCS was eligible to file a complaint with the Attorney General's Office. Chris N. asked what legal counsel had recommended. Darshan T. stated that counsel had provided several options, including filing a complaint with the Attorney General's Office or sending a demand letter to the donors. He explained that LFDCS did not favor involving the donors further because they had already been contacted and were not responsible for the Fund's actions. Darshan T. stated that counsel had identified filing an official complaint with the Attorney General's Office as the recommended option.

Chris N. asked whether the donors also contributed to the Fund's other programs. Darshan T. responded that he did not believe they did and explained that their intention was specifically to support LFDCS students. He added that two of the three donors he contacted believed they had donated directly to the school. He clarified that the donations had legally been made to Lawrence Family Development Inc., rather than Lawrence Family Development Charter School, although the donors had always understood that their contributions were intended for the school's students.

Chris N. asked whether LFDCS, as a state entity, could accept donations directly from donors and provide the associated tax benefits, or whether a separate 501(c)(3) nonprofit organization would be necessary. Darshan T. explained that the answer would depend on the circumstances and the amount involved. A separate 501(c)(3) organization would generally be the appropriate structure for accepting third-party donations. Although the school could potentially establish a smaller account for scholarship purposes, a separate nonprofit would be required for broader fundraising activities. Chris N. asked whether the school could establish a 501(c)(3) without creating an entirely separate Board. Darshan T. responded that a separate Board would be required. Mark V. acknowledged that this would involve creating another organization and noted that LFDCS had previously discussed the issue with legal counsel. Given the school's history and current circumstances, he expressed reluctance to create another nonprofit. However, he recognized that if the school wanted to conduct meaningful fundraising and eventually

take control of the scholarship endowments, an appropriate independent organization would be needed. He also noted that LFDCS, as a school entity, should not directly control those funds.
Chris N. reminded the Board that the matter had previously been referred to the Finance Committee for further review, but the committee had not met in October. He suggested that the Finance Committee revisit the issue at its next meeting in November and explore whether another established nonprofit organization, such as a community foundation, could hold the scholarship funds on the school's behalf. Darshan T. confirmed that donors were not limited to contributing to Lawrence Family Development Inc. and could instead donate to another qualified 501(c)(3) organization. Chris N. asked whether there was an established organization in Lawrence that could serve this purpose, similar to a community foundation in Boston. Darshan T. stated that this would need to be researched.

Chris N. then asked whether LFDCS should proceed with filing a complaint with the Attorney General’s Office at that time. Mark V. expressed concern about the timing of such action, particularly because LFDCS was preparing to negotiate the acquisition of the campus from the Fund. He acknowledged that the Fund had clearly failed to meet its obligations and that there might be broader financial concerns. However, he noted that the outstanding scholarship payments at that point were estimated to be less than $10,000. Mark V. emphasized that the school needed to consider the potential impact of escalating the matter while the campus acquisition negotiations were approaching. He acknowledged the serious harm caused by the delayed scholarship payments, explaining that families had been placed in difficult situations and that the school’s reputation with the high schools and community had suffered. He noted that, despite explaining that the Fund was responsible for issuing the checks, LFDCS was still viewed as an unreliable partner by the schools receiving scholarship students. He stated that the Board needed to balance addressing the scholarship concerns with the larger goal of acquiring the campus.
Chris N. asked how much money the Fund was holding in total, beyond the annual scholarship payments. Mark V. explained that the largest amount was approximately $1.6 million, representing funds originally raised by the school. He stated that approximately $1 million had initially been raised and that the amount had grown to $1.6 million through investments. He also noted that there were restrictions under the nonprofit’s charter regarding how much could be distributed. Chris N. asked whether there was any indication that the Fund might be approaching insolvency. Mark V. responded that there was no confirmed information but there are signs, including phone service being disconnected and other interruptions in services.
Chris N. reiterated that the matter had previously been referred to the Finance Committee and should be reviewed in greater detail. He also raised questions that might need to be directed to legal counsel regarding the potential consequences if the Fund became insolvent or filed for bankruptcy, particularly as it relates to LFDCS’s lease agreement with the Fund. Mark V. explained that if the Fund defaulted on its obligations, the bank could turn to LFDCS because the school guarantees the mortgage under the lease

agreement. As a result, the school would be directly involved in any default or bankruptcy process. Chris N. asked whether LFDCS should temporarily hold off on filing a complaint with the Attorney General's Office while conducting additional research into the broader financial and legal implications, particularly in connection with the lease and campus acquisition.
Darshan T. stated that he and Mark V. were scheduled to meet with Dan Halloran on Friday and would raise the scholarship concerns again to determine what resolution the Fund was proposing. He suggested that, rather than accepting another verbal assurance, LFDCS should request that the Fund formally approve a resolution at its own Board meeting and provide LFDCS with a copy. Darshan T. explained that the proposed resolution would establish a clear process for future scholarship payments. It would require the Fund to meet with LFDCS by a specified date to review all scholarship balances, including the amounts allocated to each school and student, and ensure that all scholarship checks are issued by June 1. He emphasized that this commitment should be formally approved by the Fund's Board rather than provided only as a verbal promise.
Chris N. asked Darshan T. to clarify which resolution he was referring to, and Darshan T. reiterated that the purpose would be to establish a formal, Board-approved schedule for reviewing scholarship information and issuing payments on time in future years.
Mark V. added that LFDCS had previously requested that the Fund transfer approximately $120,000, representing the scholarship balance, directly to the school in one payment so that LFDCS could distribute the funds. However, the Fund rejected that proposal. Darshan T. agreed and explained that the proposed arrangement would essentially have been a reverse custodial agreement, in which the Fund would transfer custody of the scholarship money to LFDCS for the benefit of its students. The Fund declined to do so.

Chris N. quickly researched and found information on the Greater Lawrence Community Fund and suggested that the Finance Committee contact the organization to determine whether it could hold the scholarship funds in a separate account on behalf of LFDCS, without requiring the school to establish another 501(c)(3). Darshan T. clarified that creating an entirely new organization with a separate Board would be the least desirable option for LFDCS. Dave D. also mentioned the Essex County Community Foundation (ECCF), which manages various funds established through donor contributions for specific purposes. Mark V. clarified that ECCF already manages the approximately $1.6 million scholarship endowment. Although the Fund is indirectly involved, the money is entrusted to ECCF. Chris N. asked whether the $1.6 million was already held by ECCF. Mark V. explained that, according to Dan Halloran, the funds are invested with Fidelity, managed by ECCF, and entrusted to the Fund.

Chris N. stated that additional legal research was needed to determine the appropriate way to transfer or safeguard the scholarship funds. He emphasized that if LFDCS were to make a formal demand, the school needed to identify a suitable organization that could receive the funds and provide appropriate governance and oversight. Mark V. explained that when he and Darshan T. previously met with the Fund, they requested that the

scholarship balance be transferred and that the Fund provide supporting documentation, including grant records, endowment statements, and detailed information about the balances. The Fund rejected the transfer request and refused to provide the requested documentation. Darshan T. added that LFDCS had specifically proposed reviewing the financial statements month by month to examine each deposit and withdrawal. However, the Fund refused to participate in that review.

Chris N. emphasized that the Board needed to consider the full amount of money involved, particularly the approximately $1.6 million endowment. He stated that the Board needed to determine what action to demand from the Fund and whether that would involve the Attorney General's Office or another legal process. He identified ECCF and the Greater Lawrence Community Fund as possible organizations that could receive and manage the funds. Darshan T. suggested that LFDCS explore consolidating all scholarship funds under ECCF. He explained that the Patricia Foley Karl Scholarship was already managed by ECCF, while other scholarships were managed directly by the Fund. Consolidating the scholarship funds under ECCF could provide a possible alternative arrangement. Chris N. agreed that this option should be explored. He reiterated that if the Fund were approaching insolvency, the implications could extend beyond the scholarship funds and affect the school's mortgage guarantee and lease obligations. He stated that the Fund's reported actions and lack of cooperation raised concerns that needed to be addressed promptly.
J. Henriquez left at 6:33 PM.
Mark V. reminded the Board that a special Finance Committee meeting needed to be scheduled before October 30. He specifically noted that Chris N. and Jose H. should coordinate the meeting, although it did not need to be scheduled during the current discussion. The meeting would allow the committee to further review the audit and the outstanding scholarship fund concerns.
Darshan T. stated that the Board could not proceed with the matter at hand because a quorum was no longer present. Jose H. had stepped out of the meeting due to another engagement, which left the Board without a quorum. Attempts were made to contact Rita A. to see if she was available to join.

Darshan T. clarified that, because the Board no longer had a quorum, the remainder of the meeting would be limited to informational updates and sharing information. The Board could not take any votes or engage in deliberations.

Mark V. then asked whether the Finance Committee could proceed with scheduling a meeting, since enough committee members were present to coordinate a date. Darshan T. confirmed that a quorum of the Finance Committee was available. Mark V. suggested tentatively selecting a date and following up with Jose H. to confirm his availability, since he was the only Finance Committee member absent. He also clarified that scheduling the committee meeting would be a committee matter rather than an action requiring a full Board vote.

Mark V. suggested that the Finance Committee coordinate a meeting date separately from the full Board meeting and send out a notice with a few possible dates. Darshan T. agreed and explained that the date could be tentatively selected and finalized through email. He noted that, under Open Meeting Law, circulating proposed meeting dates and setting agenda items through email are permitted because they do not constitute deliberation.

Mark V. stated that the committee would determine the agenda, which would likely include a review of the audit and the concerns surrounding the scholarship fund that had already been discussed. The committee would address both matters at its meeting. Darshan T. provided an update regarding the ongoing construction on West Street, in front of the school. The City of Lawrence originally planned to begin construction on the first day of school and issued a no-parking order on August 10. During the previous Board meeting, members contacted the Mayor and the DPW to request that construction be postponed to avoid disrupting the opening of school. However, the city proceeded with the project. After the school explained the safety concerns and the difficulties construction would create during student arrival and dismissal, the city agreed to limit construction hours to 8:30 a.m. to 2:30 p.m. and resume after 4:00 p.m. The city initially promised that the work would be completed by August 31, explaining that the project would take approximately one week. When that deadline was missed, the city extended the completion date to September 11. On September 14, new signs were posted indicating that construction would continue through October 11. As of October 14, approximately seven weeks after construction began, the project remained unfinished, despite the original one-week estimate. Darshan T. reported that the city had not provided further communication, had failed to follow the agreed-upon construction hours, and continued closing roads without advance notice or proper detour signs. On several occasions, city trucks blocked West Street, preventing school staff from passing through, despite an agreement that employees would be allowed access by presenting their school identification. However, no city employee was available to verify their identification. On September 18, the school, through its attorneys, sent a formal letter to Jorge Jaime, Director of Public Works, Teodoro Rosario, Acting City Engineer, and Timothy Houghton, City Attorney, outlining the difficulties, safety concerns, and agreements that had not been honored. The city did not respond to the letter, return the attorneys' calls or emails, or provide an updated construction schedule. Darshan T. also presented photographs and videos documenting the conditions students, parents, and staff have been forced to navigate, including blocked roads, unfinished sidewalks, holes, and unsafe walking areas between school buildings. Chloe P. added that communication with construction workers had stopped after the work reached the area in front of the school gates. She reported that West Street was sometimes closed before 7:30 a.m., without detour signs, leaving staff unable to reach the school and forcing them to turn around. She also described difficulties during dismissal, including an incident at approximately 3:10 p.m. when the road remained closed, requiring the custodian to go outside and speak with the construction workers before they moved their equipment. Parents have repeatedly expressed frustration and asked when the construction would be completed. The lack of

communication and failure to honor the city's commitments have created ongoing stress for staff and families. Darshan T. stated that the school had made every effort to cooperate with the city but felt that the city was disregarding the school's concerns. He also explained that the school had identified the city officials responsible for the situation but had chosen not to take action that might embarrass individuals who also have children attending the school. The construction was not considered emergency work, as the DPW Director had previously stated that the project involved only sidewalk repairs and would take approximately one week.

Darshan T. explained that the school's attorneys had prepared to pursue injunctive relief but had initially held off out of consideration for the city officials involved. He confirmed that the Board had previously granted him the authority to pursue legal action, including seeking an injunction, if he determined it was necessary. After further discussion, Darshan T. stated that he would follow up with the attorneys, explore the next steps, and proceed under the authority already granted by the Board. He also agreed to inform the Board Chair of the action being considered. Chris N. reiterated concerns that the city had not been honest about the nature and timeline of the work, particularly since the city had confirmed that it was not emergency construction.
R. Almanzar arrived at 7:05 PM.
Darshan T. also provided an update regarding the September 1 municipal primary election held at the 404 Haverhill Street building, also known as the Quintana building. The building is listed with the state as an official polling location, but the City of Lawrence never notified the school that it intended to use the facility for the election. According to Darshan T., the school confirmed with the Massachusetts Election Commission that municipalities are responsible for coordinating with the occupants of listed polling locations to ensure the facility is properly prepared for public voting. The city failed to coordinate with the school or establish the necessary safety arrangements. As a result, poll workers arrived early on September 1 and began setting up voting equipment and staffing the building while students were present. There were no arrangements for separate entrances or physical separation between the voting public and students, allowing unscreened adults to walk throughout the building, including using student bathrooms. Darshan T. stated that this created serious concerns regarding student safety. To accommodate the unannounced election, the school was forced to cancel a scheduled parent-teacher open house and student testing that were supposed to take place in the building. When the school questioned the city clerk, who was present that day, about the lack of preparation, she explained that she had been told by the city employee responsible for coordinating with the school that all necessary safety arrangements had already been made. Darshan T. clarified that this information was incorrect. He brought the matter to the Board's attention to explain that the city had placed the school in the position of having to choose between protecting student safety and accommodating the public's right to vote, and to seek the Board's guidance on preventing the same situation from happening during the November election or future elections. After Rita A. joined the meeting and a quorum was established, Darshan T. repeated the concerns for the Board. Other public schools had been closed on election

day, while LFDCS remained open because the city had not coordinated its plans with the school.

Dave D. suggested the school should request that the 404 Haverhill Street building no longer be used as a polling location for the November 3 election unless the city addressed the safety concerns and completed the necessary sidewalk and street repairs. Raising these concerns with the city clerk could serve as an additional strategy to motivate the city to work with the DPW and complete the construction so the property could safely accommodate both students and the voting public. Darshan T. agreed that it was worth exploring. Chris N. stated that the circumstances continued to appear questionable, noting that the city seemed to be deliberately disrupting school operations through the construction work and had separately held an election at the school without notifying the administration or providing an opportunity to adjust school operations. Dave D. asked Darshan T. whether he believed the situation involved retaliation, Darshan T. stated that he believed it did, without a doubt. Germinudy L. characterized the city's actions as an abuse of power and agreed. Rita A. also expressed concern about the lack of communication, the city's failure to request permission before using the school building, and the continued delays in completing the construction, particularly as October was already underway and winter was approaching. Darshan T. further explained that on election day, the school refused to allow members of the public to use student bathrooms or enter areas where children were present because of safety concerns. Election workers had compared the school's restrictions to those at Frost School, where the public was reportedly permitted to move throughout the building. However, Darshan T. clarified that Frost School had communicated with the city in advance and had no students in the building on election day. He also pointed out that election procedures require appropriate separation between students and the voting public when a school is being used as a polling location. Darshan T. described the situation as an untenable position in which the school was forced to choose between accommodating the public's right to vote and protecting student safety.

IV. IT Department

A. Data and Infrastructure Security Measures

Darshan T. and Tony S. provided background on the school's efforts to protect student and employee information. He explained that in January 2025, PowerSchool experienced a student information system data breach, which required the school to notify affected individuals. Following the incident, LFDCS worked with the law firm McDonald Hopkins, which advised organizations affected by the breach, to develop a protocol to strengthen the security of the school's data and information. The protocol was established with legal counsel and has been followed by the school since January 2025. Massachusetts recently updated its regulations, requiring organizations to maintain a written data security plan, known as a Written Information Security Plan (WISP). Although the school

had already been following the established security procedures, the updated regulation requires the plan to be formally documented. He directed the Board to the WISP included in the meeting packet and explained that Section 7 addresses technical safeguards for protecting the school's computer systems. Specifically, Massachusetts regulation 201 CMR 17.04 identifies eight requirements that must be addressed in the security plan. Darshan T. explained that the school was presenting the written protocol for the Board's approval and invited Tony S. to review the accompanying document, which outlines how LFDCS meets each of the eight requirements.

Tony S. reviewed the school's security measures, beginning with secure users and protocols. He explained that LFDCS uses badge-based access control throughout all school buildings, allowing employees to enter designated doors according to scheduled access permissions. The system is cloud-based and gives the school complete control over which buildings employees can access and during what hours. If an employee leaves the school or loses a badge, the Technology Department can immediately disable it. The school no longer relies on traditional keys for building access. Tony S. also reviewed the password requirements, explaining that passwords must contain 12 characters and that the school uses two-factor authentication, requiring employees to verify their identity through their phones when logging into systems. Passwords must be changed every 120 days. After three unsuccessful login attempts, an account is automatically blocked for 30 minutes, and the Technology Department receives a notification. If another incident occurs, the account is disabled and must be reactivated by the Technology Department. The school also maintains login activity logs that allow the department to monitor who is attempting to access accounts and where the attempts originate, including whether they come from inside or outside the United States. Tony S. explained that student records are maintained in PowerSchool, while employee information is hosted through ADP. Therefore, the school does not locally store student or employee information on its own systems. The information stored on local computers is primarily teachers' work, curriculum, and materials used for classroom instruction. Each teacher has an individual directory under their assigned account, and access is restricted so that only the individual teacher can access their curriculum files.

Tony S. discussed the school's encryption, monitoring, and network security measures. He explained that all school computers, laptops, devices, and firewalls are monitored 24 hours a day, seven days a week. If the system detects suspicious activity, an intrusion, or a virus, the affected computer is immediately locked down and disconnected from the network to prevent the threat from spreading. The antivirus monitoring software identifies unusual changes in computer behavior at any time of day, including overnight, when many attempted security breaches occur. The school's monitoring center notifies the Technology Department when a device has been disabled, identifying the user and device involved so the department can investigate and determine the appropriate response. If a computer is believed to have been compromised, it is wiped clean, restored, and restarted. Firewalls are also monitored continuously and block suspicious network traffic. Tony S. explained that these measures address the regulation's

requirements for system monitoring and firewall protection. For malware protection, LFDCS uses CrowdStrike, which detects and prevents viruses, malware, and ransomware. The software continuously monitors computer activity and automatically disconnects any desktop displaying unusual or suspicious behavior from the network. Although this requires the Technology Department to investigate and analyze the activity before restoring the device, it helps prevent an infected computer from compromising the entire school network.

Tony S. also reviewed the school's software patching and employee education procedures. He explained that LFDCS uses an application that continuously monitors school computers and identifies their software versions, required updates, and security patches. The system distinguishes between critical updates and less urgent patches, and the Technology Department schedules the installation of necessary updates each night. As a result, computers are updated daily, and employees may regularly see notifications indicating that software updates are being installed. LFDCS conducts security awareness campaigns twice a year, with each campaign lasting two weeks. During these campaigns, employees receive simulated phishing emails designed to resemble legitimate messages, such as UPS package notifications and other common email communications. The Technology Department monitors which employees click on the simulated emails and uses those results to develop additional training to help staff recognize suspicious messages. Tony S. reported that the program has been successful, noting that many employees now contact the Technology Department through help desk tickets when they receive questionable emails to verify whether the messages are legitimate or fraudulent.
D. DeFillippo made a motion to approve the WISP.
R. Almanzar seconded the motion.
The board **VOTED** to approve the motion.

Roll Call

D. DeFillippo	Aye
R. Almanzar	Aye
L. Perez	Absent
J. Cedeno	Aye
E. Nolberto	Absent
C. Needham	Aye
G. Lopez	Aye
J. Henriquez	Absent

V. Assistant Superintendent's Report

A. Restraint Policy for approval

Sally S. presented the updated Restraint Policy and explained that the revisions were necessary to comply with DESE guidance and regulations issued in August regarding seclusion. She clarified that although LFDCS was already following practices that prohibited the use of seclusion as described in the new regulations, the state required the school to formally update its existing policy to include the specific language and

definitions outlined by DESE. Sally S. reviewed the updates made by Hali C., which provide operational definitions of key terms and clarify the new restrictions on seclusion. Specifically, seclusion is defined as placing a student who is dysregulated in a separate room alone with the door locked, which is no longer permitted. She emphasized that LFDCS was not practicing this type of seclusion but was required to include the updated language in its policy. The policy also outlines the appropriate procedures for emergency situations in which a student needs to be removed from a classroom, ensuring that trained staff supervise and provide care to the student until further assistance is available. Sally S. confirmed that the policy had been revised according to the instructions provided by the school's DESE representative and requested the Board's approval and submission promptly to the DESE.
C. Needham made a motion to approve the revised Restraint Policy.
D. DeFillippo seconded the motion.
The board **VOTED** to approve the motion.

Roll Call

C. Needham	Aye
L. Perez	Absent
E. Nolberto	Absent
J. Cedeno	Aye
D. DeFillippo	Aye
G. Lopez	Aye
R. Almanzar	Aye
J. Henriquez	Absent

B. Time and Effort Policy for Approval

Sally S. presented the second policy regarding time and effort documentation associated with the school's federal grants. She explained that DESE requires the school to have a formal policy outlining how employee time and effort dedicated to federally funded programs will be documented. She provided the example of Title I staff whose salaries are partially covered by federal funds. The school must maintain documentation demonstrating that the time employees spend working on the Title I program is directly related to the program and that employees understand their responsibilities and are aware that a portion of their salaries is funded through federal grants. Sally S. clarified that LFDCS did not previously have a formal written policy addressing this requirement. She confirmed that the new policy was developed to include all the requirements and procedures specified by DESE and requested the Board's approval so the school could meet the state's expectations.
C. Needham made a motion to approve the time and effort policy to be adopted as written.
D. DeFillippo seconded the motion.
The board **VOTED** to approve the motion.

Roll Call

R. Almanzar	Aye

Roll Call

D. DeFillippo	Aye
C. Needham	Aye
E. Nolberto	Absent
G. Lopez	Aye
J. Henriquez	Absent
L. Perez	Absent
J. Cedeno	Aye

C. Needham left at 7:36 PM.

C. PD for informational purposes only:

Sally S. explained that she had originally planned to provide a professional development presentation for the Board on board conduct, responsibilities, and Open Meeting Law. The presentation was intended as a refresher for current members and an introduction for new members. However, because the Commissioner has not yet approved the two new Board members, they are unable to officially participate in meetings. As a result, Sally S. will bring the presentation back at next month's meeting.

She noted that the presentation is lengthy and covers several areas of Board responsibilities, offers suggestions for topics members should review, and includes fictional scenarios to help members understand how to handle different situations. It also contains numerous links to helpful resources that Board members can refer to throughout the year. At next month's meeting, Sally S. plans to review the presentation without going through every resource in detail. Instead, she has organized the links into a separate document and plans to select a few resources each month for further discussion. This will allow the Board to continue reviewing these topics throughout the year.

D. Policy List

Sally S. explained that there have been some difficulties scheduling a Policy Subcommittee meeting and getting enough members to attend. She will email all members of the Policy Subcommittee by the end of the week with possible meeting dates. She will also contact the Governance and Nomination Subcommittee members to schedule another meeting to discuss ways to recruit community members. Sally S. asked everyone on both subcommittees to watch for her emails this week so they can get the meetings scheduled.

E. PD Links page for informational purposes only.

Sally S. showed the Board a document titled "PD Links," which contains the professional development resources included in her presentation. She explained that the links are listed in the same order as the presentation and are available for Board members to review whenever they have questions. She will briefly go over the links during next month's presentation and then choose a few each month to discuss in more detail. She

wanted to make sure everyone was aware that the document is available for their reference throughout the year.

F. Pre-Quiz:

Sally S. went through a quiz exercise with the Board.

G. Invite to Wellness Committee

Sally S. shared that she is now chairing the Wellness Committee and invited Board members to participate. She mentioned that Jose Tejada served on the committee last year and encouraged anyone interested in joining to let her know. The committee has three remaining meetings scheduled for January 20, March 17, and May 19. She also explained that the committee has several subcommittees that members may participate in. Board members can contact her with their interest, and she will follow up again at next month’s meeting if needed.

VI. Principal's Report

A. MCAS Accountability Results

Hali C. presented the school's recently released 2026 MCAS accountability results. There were significant improvements in several grade levels and subject areas compared to 2025. Students in grades 3-8 take English Language Arts (ELA) and Math assessments annually, while Science, Technology, and Engineering assessments are administered in grades 5 and 8. Eighth-grade students also participate in the Civics MCAS. Overall, the school demonstrated progress in ELA, Math, and Science. In ELA, grades 3, 5, and 7 showed significant increases in the percentage of students meeting or exceeding expectations. Fifth-grade ELA results were especially impressive, tripling the percentage of students meeting or exceeding expectations and achieving the best scores in the past four years. In Math, grades 3, 5, and 6 also increased their percentages of students meeting or exceeding expectations. Fifth-grade Math achieved its strongest results since before COVID, indicating a full recovery to pre-pandemic performance levels, while sixth-grade Math doubled the percentage of students meeting or exceeding expectations. Fifth-grade Science also achieved its best results in approximately four to five years. Hali C. acknowledged that although the school has not yet reached its desired performance levels, the results demonstrate that the school is moving in the right direction.

Hali C. then explained the Massachusetts accountability system, which evaluates schools based on several indicators, including academic achievement, student growth, progress toward English proficiency, and chronic absenteeism. Since LFDCS is a K–8 school, high school completion is not applicable. Chronic absenteeism is defined as students missing 10% or more of the school year, which equates to 18 or more days. The state assigns different weights to these indicators, with greater emphasis placed on academic achievement than on growth, English proficiency, and additional measures. Based on the combined results, schools receive scores ranging from zero to four points and are placed

into accountability categories. LFDCS was classified as making substantial progress toward its targets, with 51% progress toward its improvement targets, and was not identified as requiring assistance or intervention. The state also evaluates the progress of the school's lowest-performing student group by identifying students who ranked in the bottom 25% in ELA and Math during the previous year's assessments and examining whether they made progress on the following year's assessments.

Hali C. highlighted both areas of improvement and areas requiring continued attention for the individual accountability indicators. In Math, the school experienced a decrease in achievement points. However, it gained points in student growth for both the overall student population and the lowest-performing students. The school recently implemented a new Math curriculum and is hopeful that it will contribute to stronger results moving forward. In ELA, the school increased its overall performance, gaining one point in growth for all students, as well as one point in achievement and one point in growth for its lowest-performing students. These results demonstrate progress in supporting students who need additional academic assistance. Science was another significant area of improvement, with the school earning three additional achievement points compared to the previous year, when it had earned none. ELL also demonstrated substantial improvement. After earning no accountability points for this population in the previous year, the school earned three out of four possible points for student progress on the ACCESS assessment.

Another particularly strong area was chronic absenteeism, where LFDCS earned the full four out of four possible accountability points for another consecutive year. The school's chronic absenteeism rate was reported at approximately 2.7%, significantly lower than the Massachusetts state rate of 17.1%. Hali C. noted that nearly one in five students statewide misses at least 18 school days annually, compared with approximately 2% of students at LFDCS.

Hali C. also reviewed the performance of specific student subgroups to identify areas where additional support is needed. For the high-needs subgroup, the school experienced a decline in Math achievement and Math growth points, reinforcing that Math remains an area requiring focused attention. The new Math curriculum is expected to help address these challenges and improve student outcomes. For ELL and former ELL, the school saw positive progress on ACCESS assessments but experienced a decline in Math performance, reflecting the broader Math challenges identified throughout the report. Special Education students, on the other hand, demonstrated improvements in both ELA achievement and growth. Hali C. highlighted that the school earned 36% of the possible accountability points for its Special Education students, more than doubling the 17% earned the previous year.

Hali C. outlined several initiatives already underway to help address the remaining academic gaps and continue improving student performance. In ELA, the school received a Level Up Grant that will be used to strengthen assessments and assignments by

incorporating more applied learning and project-based opportunities. The school has also updated its phonics materials to strengthen foundational reading skills in the early grades, recognizing that these skills are essential to students' continued reading development as they progress into the upper grades. In Math, the newly adopted curriculum is being supported through ongoing professional development for teachers. Teachers received initial training in August and will continue receiving professional development throughout the school year to ensure the curriculum is implemented consistently and as intended. Another training session recently took place, with an additional session scheduled for February. For ELL, the school added another ELL teacher to ensure it can continue providing a full range of services as enrollment and student needs expand. The school is also placing greater emphasis on vocabulary instruction across academic content areas, with increased collaboration between ELL teachers and general education teachers. Although students have demonstrated strong progress on ACCESS assessments, the goal is to ensure that this progress also translates into improved MCAS performance.

B. School Site Council Meeting Minutes

Hali C. shared that the School Site Council held its first meeting on September 23. Attendance was strong, with 12 parents participating in person and another 12 joining virtually. The meeting began with voting to welcome and elect new parent representatives to the council. Hali C. provided parents with an overview of the school's Crisis Prevention Institute training, which teaches staff de-escalation techniques and strategies for responding to escalating behaviors. This topic was included in response to feedback from the previous year's parent survey, in which families requested more information about how the school manages behavioral situations. The goal was to help parents better understand the strategies and approaches staff members are taught, while also sharing techniques that families might find useful at home. The presentation led to a productive discussion and an opportunity for parents to ask questions and share their thoughts.

Hali C. invited parents to suggest topics they would like the School Site Council to address throughout the school year. She compiled the suggestions into several categories and distributed them to council members so they could vote on which topics they would like to prioritize for future discussions. Family engagement was identified as one of the major areas of interest, particularly how the school can encourage greater parental involvement and strengthen connections between families and the school community. Wellness was another important topic, with parents expressing interest in discussing related initiatives and concerns. Academic support was also raised, with parents requesting practical strategies to help their children with specific subjects, particularly Math, and guidance on how they can reinforce learning at home. Additionally, parents expressed interest in Special Education and ways to ensure that all students receive the support they need to succeed academically.

C.

High School Fair

Hali C. reported that the school hosted a successful high school fair, with nearly 30 high schools from across New England and beyond participated and met with students. Hali C. encouraged families and board members to follow the school's Facebook page so they can view photos from the high school fair and other school events like the fifth-grade Hispanic Heritage event held the previous week.

D. Bullying PSAs

Hali C. reported on the school's activities in recognition of October's National Bullying Prevention Month. LFDCS began its efforts with a Unity Day celebration, during which students and staff wore orange on Jeans Day to promote unity and raise awareness about bullying prevention. The following week, teachers were provided with resources and materials to incorporate into morning meetings and advisory periods to facilitate discussions and activities focused on preventing bullying. Hali C. also recognized Ms. Stukuls, Tricia Chisholm, and Ms. Mara for working with students across grade levels to create anti-bullying public service announcements (PSAs). Three PSAs were developed, with one each from the Academy, Lower School, and Upper School, allowing students to share anti-bullying messages with their peers. Hali C. presented the Academy's PSA, recognizing the students' excellent work in promoting awareness and encouraging a positive, respectful school environment.

VII. Closing Items

A. Adjourn Meeting

R. Almanzar made a motion to adjourn.
D. DeFillippo seconded the motion.
The board **VOTED** to approve the motion.

Roll Call

J. Henriquez	Absent
R. Almanzar	Aye
J. Cedeno	Aye
D. DeFillippo	Aye
G. Lopez	Aye
C. Needham	Absent
E. Nolberto	Absent
L. Perez	Absent

There being no further business to be transacted, and upon motion duly made, seconded and approved, the meeting was adjourned at 8:05 PM.

Respectfully Submitted,
Y. Rodriguez

Documents used during the meeting

- LFDCS Financial Statements - Draft for MD&A.pdf
- LFDCS_QPD_Real_Estate_Advisory_Proposal_Clean_SEP26_10.09.26_MV.docx
- LFDCS_Retirement Savings Plan Board Memo_10.06.26_MV.docx
- LFDCS_Retirement Savings Plan Resolutions_10.06.26_MV.docx
- Docs for BoT 10_14_26 (2).pdf
- Written_Information_Security_Plan_WISP.pdf
- LFDCS_Cybersecurity_Report.docx
- BOT PD_ Board conduct, Responsibilities, and Open Meeting Law.pptx
- Links to BOT Resources.docx
- Final Pre-PD Quiz on OML.docx
- Policy Drafts 2026-2027.docx
- Restraint Policy (1).docx
- LFDCS Time and Effort Policy.docx
- MCAS Accountability Results 2026.pptx
- School Site council minutes 092326 minutes.docx