FACTFINDING REPORT OF THREE AREAS OF INQUIRY POSED BY THE
AMESBURY SCHOOL COMMITTEE

made a complaint at the Amesbury School Committee (hereinafter “SC”) meeting and requested an investigation into

Specifically, requested that the SC investigate

(See Exhibit 22.)

On, the SC voted to retain Discrimination and Harassment Solutions, LLC to conduct an investigation and prepare a report limited to the following three areas of inquiry:

1. The events at issue, all as outlined in greater detail in:

2. The actions, if any, taken by:

3. Whether:
Accordingly, this investigation will provide findings of fact and conclusions regarding the three areas of inquiry as presented by the SC on (c), (f).

I. WITNESSES INTERVIEWED OR STATEMENTS RECEIVED

1. (c), (f)
2. (c), (f)
3. (c), (f)
4. (c), (f)
5. (a), (c), (f)
6. (c), (f)
7. (c), (f)
8. (c), (f)

II. DOCUMENTS/VIDEOS RELIED UPON

Exhibit 1 – (c), (f)
Exhibit 2 – (c), (f)
Exhibit 3 – (c), (f)
Exhibit 4 – SC meeting video (c), (f)
Exhibit 5 – Documents produced by (c), (f)
Exhibit 6 – (c), (f)
Exhibit 7 – Statement presented by (c), (f)
Exhibit 8 – Statement presented by (c), (f)

Exhibit 9 – (c), (f) email communications regarding (c), (f)

Exhibit 10 – SC Staff Communications Policy

Exhibit 11 – SC Member Authority

Exhibit 12 – SC meeting video (c), (f)

Exhibit 13 – Email chain between (c), (f)

Exhibit 14 – Emails produced by (c), (f)

Exhibit 15 – Additional Emails sent by (a), (c), (f)

Exhibit 16– (a), (c), (f) email from (a), (c), (f)

Exhibit 17 – (a), (c), (f) email exchange between (a), (c), (f)

Exhibit 18 – (a), (c), (f) email exchange between (a), (c), (f)

Exhibit 19 - (c), (f) to (c), (f)

Exhibit 20 - (a), (c), (f) email to (a), (c), (f)

Exhibit 21 – SC minutes (c), (f)

Exhibit 22 – SC minutes (c), (f)

Exhibit 23 – Email communications between (c), (f)
 Exhibit 24 – Email communications between [c], (f)

III. FINDINGS OF FACT

Having considered all the evidence and testimony and giving the appropriate weight thereto, and based on the applicable standard of proof, a preponderance of the evidence, I make the following relevant findings of fact:

1. [c], (f)

2. [c], (f)
   (Interview of [c], (f))

3. [c], (f)
   (Interview of [c], (f))

4. [c], (f)
   (Interview of [c], (f))

5. [c], (f)
   (Id.)

6. [c], (f)
   (Interview of [c], (f))
7. (c), (f) (See Exhibit 8)

8. (c), (f) (Interview of (c), (f))

Issue No. 1. The events (c), (f) at issue (c), (f), all as outlined in greater detail in (c), (f)

i. Events of (c), (f)

9. In (a), (c), (f). Upon learning of (a), (c), (f) sent an email to (a), (c), (f) (a), (c), (f) (See Exhibit 16) The email was sent from (a), (c), (f) to an email (a), (c), (f) (Id.)

10. (c), (f)

11. (c), (f) advised that (c), (f) Thereafter, (c), (f)
12. (c), (f) then sent a response to (c), (f) on (c), (f), advising that (c), (f)

(See Exhibit 16)

13. Next, on (c), (f), (c), (f) emailed (c), (f), requesting an (a), (c), (f)

As with the email (c), (f) sent to (c), (f) sent this email from (c), (f). (See Exhibit 17)

14. (c), (f)

(Interview of (c), (f) )

15. (c), (f) explained to (c), (f) that (a), (c), (f)

(c), (f)

(Interview of (c), (f) )

16. (c), (f)

(Id.)

17. (c), (f) then sent an email to (c), (f) on (c), (f), to (c), (f)

The email, which was sent from (c), (f), addressed (c), (f)

www.dhsworks.com  781-910-0820  rryan@dhsworks.com
18. On [c, f], [c, f] met with [c, f] was present. [a, c, f]

(See Exhibit 23)

19. [c, f] emailed [e, f] to report [c, f]

(Interview of [c, f] and Exhibit 23)

20. Next, [c, f] emailed [c, f] to report [c, f]

explained that [c, f]

(a, c, f) (See Exhibit 24)

21. From the tone of the emails to [c, f], it is apparent that [c, f]

(See Exhibits 23 and 24)

22. After this exchange with [c, f], [c, f] began to send [c, f] emails [c, f]

(See Exhibit 18)
23. On [(c), (f)] [on dates], [(c), (f)] sent an email to [(c), (f)] regarding the
[(c), (f)]
[(Id.)]

24. All of the emails sent to [(c), (f)] from [(c), (f)] in [(c), (f)] were
sent from [(c), (f)]. (See Exhibit 14)

25. Next, on [(c), (f)] [(on dates)], [(c), (f)] sent an email to [(c), (f)] from [(c), (f)]
[(c), (f)] questioning the [(c), (f)] on this email. (See Exhibit 19)

26. [(c), (f)] began to question [(c), (f)]. Notably, [(c), (f)] did not question [(c), (f)].
[(c), (f)] requested documentation [(c), (f)].

[(c), (f) (Interview of [(c), (f)])]

27. Next, on [(c), (f)] [(on dates)], [(c), (f)] began to question [(c), (f)]
[(c), (f)] sent an email to [(c), (f)]. (See Exhibit 20 and
interview of [(c), (f)])

28. During the process of considering [(c), (f)]
29. Over a period beginning in, sent the following emails to from:

(See Exhibit 5)

30. Additionally, sent emails to from regarding

(See Exhibit 15)

31. explains that emailed on a couple of occasions, As a result, (Interview of)

32. There is a SC policy that provides, “” (See Exhibit 10)
33. A separate SC policy provides that, “(c), (f)” (See Exhibit 11)

34. (c), (f) admits that (c), (f) these SC policies (c), (f)

35. In fact, (c), (f) email sent from (c), (f) the email dated (c), (f), (c), (f), and (c), (f) the emails sent from (c), (f)

ii. (c), (f)

36. (c), (f), on (c), (f), when the SC was voting on (c), (f), (c), (f) expressed (c), (f)

(c), (f). At the same meeting, SC member (c), (f) followed by making a motion, which was seconded by (c), (f) to (c), (f)

(c), (f). In doing so, there would be (c), (f)

(c), (f). The SC (c), (f) the motion by a vote (c), (f). (See Exhibits 2 and 7)

37. Had the SC (c), (f)
iii. (Interview of [c], [f])

38. On [c], [f] that the SC [c], [f]

39. [c], [f] informed the SC that [c], [f]. (Id.)

40. [c], [f] made a motion, which was seconded by [c], [f]

41. [c], [f] explains that [c], [f]. Moreover, [c], [f]

   (Interview of [c], [f])
42. (c), (f) 

Moreover, (c), (f) indicates that (c), (f) 

(See Exhibit 7) 

43. (c), (f) 

(Id.) 

44. (c), (f) 

(a), (c), (f) 

45. (c), (f) 

(c), (f) 

(Interview of (c), (f) 

(c), (f) ) 

46. (c), (f) reported (c), (f) 

(Interviews of (c), (f) )
47. Subsequently, on \((c), (f)\) moved the SC to \((c), (f)\).

(See Exhibits 12 and 22)

iv. The \((c), (f)\)

48. The \((c), (f)\)

(See Exhibits 1, 2, and 3)

49. The \((c), (f)\) addresses \((c), (f)\) on \((c), (f)\).

\((c), (f)\), \((c), (f)\), and \((c), (f)\). (See Exhibit 1)

50. The \((c), (f)\), dated \((c), (f)\), \((a), (c), (f)\)

(See Exhibit 2)

51. When \((a), (c), (f)\)

(See Exhibit 14 and Exhibit 2)

52. The \((c), (f)\) addresses \((c), (f)\)
B. The actions, if any, taken by

53. On (c), (f), (c), (f) received an email from (c), (f) requesting “(c), (f) (See Exhibit 6)

54. In response, (c), (f) reached out to (c), (f) and requested that he retrieve the requested records. (Interview of (c), (f))

55. (c), (f) provided (c), (f) with the responsive documents later that day. (See Exhibit 5)

56. In performing (c), (f) identified in the Freedom of Information Act (hereinafter “FOIA”) request that were to be searched, i.e. “(c), (f)”, into a search engine and was able to capture all of the emails stored on the District’s computer system that were sent between (c), (f) and (c), (f). (Interview of (c), (f))
57. Particular to search retrieved emails sent and received on email account as well as emails sent to (hereinafter “”) after (See Exhibit 5 and interview of)

58. was also able to determine that no one else conducted a search of the server for the emails of (Interview of)

59. The first email located in the search was dated and was sent from (See Exhibit 5)

60. Notably, the emails that sent from were not uncovered during search. opines that this was due to

   , when

   This explanation makes sense when comparing (See Exhibit 5 and interview of)

61. Only two emails were sent from to These emails addressed (See Exhibit 5 and interview of)
62. Upon receiving the FOIA request, \( \text{(c), (f): notified in the FOIA request, as} \) \( \text{(c), (f)} \)

\( \text{(Interview of (c), (f))} \)

63. Before authorizing the search for the records requested in the FOIA request, \( \text{(c), (f)} \)

\( \text{contacted to confirm (c), (f)} \)

\( \text{(c), (f)} \)

\( \text{(Interview of (c), (f))} \)

64. Prior to releasing the records, \( \text{(c), (f): reviewed the documents (c), (f)} \)

\( \text{(Interview of (c), (f)} \)

65. On \( \text{(c), (f)} \), \( \text{(c), (f)} \) explains that \( \text{(c), (f): attempted to send the documents to} \)

\( \text{(c), (f)} \)

\( \text{(Id.)} \)

66. Once received, \( \text{(c), (f)} \) could not open the files because they were in “.pst” format and \( \text{did not have the program required to open such files. (See Exhibit 6)} \)

67. Ultimately, \( \text{(c), (f): printed the documents, and (c), (f)} \)

\( \text{came to (c), (f) and retrieved them. (See Exhibit 5)} \)

68. \( \text{(c), (f): called (c), (f) on (c), (f) and asked for (c), (f)} \)

\( \text{and on (c), (f), (c), (f)} \)

\( \text{(See Exhibit 5 and interview of (c), (f))} \)
69. None of the emails produced by [redacted] (c), (f) (See Exhibit 5)

70. The only document produced to [redacted] (c), (f) regarding this matter was [redacted] (c), (f) (Interview of [redacted] and Exhibit 7)

71. [redacted] (c), (f) produced emails to [redacted] (c), (f) (Interviews of [redacted] and Exhibits 8 and 14.)

72. [redacted] (c), (f)

These included emails dated [redacted] (c), (f) (See Exhibit 14 and Exhibit 2)

73. These emails were all produced by [redacted] (c), (f) (Interviews of [redacted] and Exhibits 8 and 14.)

74. The email of [redacted] (c), (f) was not produced by [redacted] (c), (f) because it was outside the time frame referenced in the FOIA request by [redacted] (c), (f) (See Exhibit 6) In addition, the email dated [redacted] (c), (f) was not produced by [redacted] (c), (f)
as it was not uncovered during search because it was sent only to
FOIA request. (See Exhibit 16 and interview of)
produced these emails in response to
explained that the FOIA request and produced all of the emails that were responsive to this request.
(See Exhibit 8 and interview of)
received documents from in response to a FOIA request and (Interview of)
produced the records based on
and because
(See Exhibit 8)

1 Whether in compliance with the FOIA is beyond the scope of this investigation.
78. (See Exhibit 8 and Interview of (c), (f)"

79. (c), (f) received the emails that (c), (f)

80. (c), (f) provided (c), (f) with copies of emails because they (c), (f) (Id.)

81. When first receiving the emails, (c), (f) (Id.)

82. (c), (f) provided the emails to (c), (f) (See Exhibit 8)
83. regarding the production of the emails to . (Interviews of )

84. provided a copy of the emails exchanged between during . (Interview of )

85. . (Interview of )

86. . (See Exhibit 2)

87. These emails were produced as part of the FOIA request production sent by in response to the FOIA request. These emails addressed issues such as . (See Exhibit 5)
VI. CONCLUSIONS

The events of (c), (f) at issue, all as outlined in greater detail in (c), (f):

After (a), (c), (f)

When (c), (f)

Up until this time, (c), (f)

Beginning in the (c), (f), after (a), (c), (f)

(c), (f)

I find that there appears to be (c), (f)

It is undisputed that (a), (c), (f)

(c), (f)

Within one month of (c), (f)

Of concern
is that

In addition,

SC policies that provide that all “

” and “

,” of which

raises questions about

would likely not be covered by these SC policies, as

The emails relating to

, and other emails that

.

Moreover, I question


The actions, if any, taken by


I find that \((c), (f)\). Whether \((c), (f)\); I find that the emails released by \((c), (f)\). The emails produced by \((c), (f)\).

The emails specifically relating to \((c), (f)\). \((c), (f)\) produced the emails \((c), (f)\). Although this investigation does not conclude whether \((c), (f)\). Specifically, \((c), (f)\).
That being said,

If I may provide you with any additional information, please feel free to contact me.

Very truly yours,

Regina M. Ryan

Regina M. Ryan