

**From:** Lissa McKinney  
**Sent:** Sunday, June 01, 2014 8:59 PM  
**To:** Kathleen Snook; 'Philip Benincasa'  
**Cc:** 'Jennifer Munn'; 'Johanna Boynton'; 'Wally Johnston'  
**Subject:** Results of PRR Request to DOE on Advice issued to Superintendent and related advisories

Dear School Committee,

Attached are documents I received from DOE legal counsel regarding my PRR request for info on fees, and any advice issued to DR. [Please note the first 6 pages of the two attachments are identical, but they are not duplicates and relate to different concerns.]

[The two attachments are posted immediately below here, in the Concord list file repository, with date of June 1 2014.]

Encompassed within were responses regarding fees for musical instruments, fees for 1-1 computers, and what they define as field trips etc. Many of the DOE letters to School Districts are older, but they continue to be good law, and contain additional information to evaluate and apply to our varied field trip situations. Please read all of the doc's, because the written opinions contained in letters to other school districts have a lot of helpful information advisory to Concord as well.

The SC may erroneously accept at face value what the Superintendent represents, and the limitations and qualifications she receives might not be fully shared. This collection includes letters issued to other school districts that explain other aspects raised by what is or is not curriculum based.

**With respect to the fees for events, on May 20 DOE told Diana *directly* they could not charge fees.** The DOE representative Joel Krakow 781-338-3747 told me on May 20 that he had *already spoken directly with Diana Rigby* about this, and it was reinforced by the

immediate corrections issued by Principal Lynn Beattie. Despite that, Thoreau parents were charged the following week. Many people including myself brought this to Principal Peterson's attention. It was disregarded, and there was NO ACTION taken by the SC to prevent it, or restrict these actions. Collectively, nothing was done to prevent Administration from effectively stealing money.

Your employee continued to require money after knowing she was not to do so, and was required to advise that contributions were voluntary. Collecting money when the law is clearly otherwise may violate criminal codes in addition to DOE regulations. In any event, both the School Committee and the Superintendent were on notice of these violations before the money was collected at CMS, and *well before* it was collected at Thoreau. The continued collections seem fraudulent and arrogant in light of the clear rules on this.

It should not be an option to burden parents that paid with having to ask for their money back. It was wrongfully collected in the first place and ought to be returned without any further debate. In addition, the taxpayers should not have to bear any ridiculous legal fees for representing the Superintendent with DOE or anyone else. It is a wastefulness brought on by intentional design, and precisely why the school budget cuts are increasing every year. There ought to be an apology to the citizens, and reprimand to the Superintendent, not a strategy to keep the money, or a discussion of how burdened the staff will be to refund it. Please keep this in mind at her review as well.

The failure of the SC to intervene and take action when it should have in this and other instances does not foster trust, build relationships, or manage our assets in a manner that minimizes our expenses. I did not file an official PQA complaint because I reasonably hope you might exert some influence, giving you the benefit of the doubt you ask for.

Lissa McKinney