

CRANSTON SCHOOL COMMITTEE PUBLIC WORK SESSION

AUGUST 13, 2014

WILLIAM A. BRIGGS BUILDING (REED CONFERENCE ROOM)

845 PARK AVENUE, CRANSTON, RI

EXECUTIVE SESSION 6:00 P.M.

PUBLIC SESSION IMMEDIATELY FOLLOWING EXECUTIVE SESSION

**PUBLIC WORK SESSION IMMEDIATELY FOLLOWING PUBLIC
SESSION**

MINUTES

The School Committee meeting was held on the evening of the above date at the William A. Brigs Building with the following members present: Chairperson Iannazzi, Mrs. Culhane, Mr. Gale, Mrs. Ruggieri and Mr. Traficante. Attorney Cascione was present during Executive Session. Mrs. McFarland and Mr. Colford were absent during Executive Session.

The meeting was called to order at 6:19p.m. It was moved by Mr. Traficante and seconded by Mr. Gale to convene to Executive Session pursuant to RI State Laws -

PL 42-46-5(a)(1) Personnel:

A. Discuss Settlement Agreement re: Student A

B. Discuss Appointment of Certified Administrator A

- C. Discuss Appointment of Certified Administrator B**
- D. Discuss Appointment of Certified Administrator C**
- E. Discuss Appointment of Certified Administrator D**

PL 42-46-5(a)(2) Collective Bargaining and Litigation:

- A. Contract Negotiations' Update(s)=**
- B. (Secretaries)**
- C. (Teachers)**
- D. (Teacher Assistants\Bus Aides\Technical Assistants)**
- E. (Bus Drivers, Mechanics)**
- F. (Tradespeople)**
- G. (Custodians)**
 - a. NAGE Agreement**

PL 42-46-5(3)

- A. District Safety Plan**

Call to Order at 7:17 p.m. - Public Session

The Roll was called; a Quorum was present.

Executive Session Minutes were sealed – Ms. Iannazzi stated that no votes were taken in Executive Session. A Motion was made. Moved by Mr. Traficante; seconded by Mrs. Culhane. The roll was called; all were in favor.

** **

Action Agenda

RESOLUTIONS

ADMINISTRATION

PERSONNEL

No. 14-08-01 - RESOLVED, that the three year Collective Bargaining Agreement between the Cranston School Committee and the National Association of Governmental Employees (NAGE) Local 153, Custodians, be accepted subject to ratification by the Cranston City Council (REVISED Fiscal Analysis Attached).

A motion was made to approve. Moved by Mr. Traficante; seconded by Mrs. Ruggieri. Ms. Iannazzi asked if there were any discussions. There being none, the roll was called; all were in favor.

Adjourn to Public Session

Dr. Judith Lundsten spoke on the following topic:

Discussion of New Construction: 7000 series- to be deleted or amended (see C.P.S. for old policies)

#7000 General Policy statement- Amend

#7100 New Construction- Planning - delete. Amend to read “For pertinent legal information, refer to: General Laws of R.I., 16-2-15.”

#7110 (a)(b) Determining Needs - delete. Amend to read “For pertinent legal information, refer to: General Laws of R.I., 16-9-4 through 16-9-8.”

#7111 Projecting Educational Programs - delete. Amend to read “For pertinent legal information, refer to: General Laws of R.I., 16-9-4 through 16-9-8.”

#7113 Evaluating Existing Buildings Delete

#7114 Determining Extent of New Construction Delete

#7115 Developing Educational Specifications Delete

#7120 Patterns of Participation Delete

#7121 Involving the Staff Delete

#7122 Involving the Public Delete

#7123 Using Educational Consultants Delete

#7130 Relations with the Public Delete

#7140 Relations with other Governmental Units Delete

#7142 Relations with the State Delete

#7210 Site Development - delete and amend to read “For pertinent legal information, refer to General Laws of R.I., 16-2-25.”

#7211 Selection of Site Delete

#7212 Land Use Delete

#7213 Landscaping Delete

#7220 Building Design Delete

#7230 Equipment and Furniture Delete

#7300 Occupying Delete

#7310 Training the Staff Delete

#7320 Inspection of Completed Project Delete

#7330 Acceptance of Completed Project Delete

#7411 Bonded Indebtedness - Amend to read: Refer to General Laws of R.I., 16-60-4.9iv.

#7550 Dedication of a Project – Amend to add “Tot Parks”

#7551 Naming the Building Delete

Dr. Lundsten stated that this was a committee that Paula McFarland, myself and Joel Zisseron sat on to review the polices in the 7000 series that have to do with construction and building facilities. What we want to do is delete the ones that have to do with regulations. I will bring a new policy forward to you that states that we will need regulations for that. We had monitored these and Ron suggested, and I agree with him, that on 7120, 7121 and 7122 has to do involving the public and we may not want to delete those as we want to be transparent in what we are doing with our buildings. I am going to write a new policy combining those three to say that we are open to participating by our stakeholders. Equally so, policy 7130, 7140 and 7142 about Relations with our Governmental Unit, obviously we will go over the requirements for that and I will write a policy for that. We

will change that up to bring to you on the first reading on Monday evening. The rest of these are all covered with the current regulations that I put down as deleted or to amend to read that they refer to a general law. Regarding Policy 7550 that is when we dedicate project and Joel suggested that we move to add to that that we have parks that were dedicated that meet the policy standards that had not been listed.

Mrs. Culhane stated that we do not own the town parks so how do we have anything to do with that?

Dr. Lundsten stated that at times the parks are adjacent to our buildings, dedicated to a teacher, a principal, a beloved staff member and we just felt comfortable that we should make sure it follows a policy.

Mrs. Culhane stated that she would agree with that but we need to somehow include language that somehow includes the City in that because I don't know that we would have the authority naming a park that does not belong to us, even though it is adjacent to one of our buildings.

Dr. Lundsten stated that we can take that off.

Mrs. Culhane stated that she gets his point but we don't own those and we don't maintain them.

Dr. Lundsten stated that we will leave the dedication of a project in the policy.

Restructuring facilities and transportation department discussion

Dr. Lundsten stated that she would like to speak to the Committee about restructuring a current position for buildings and transportation (See Handouts “B” and “C” on file with the Superintendent’s office). I think what we need to do is to put that into two separate positions – Facilities Manager and Transportation Manager. We need to bring this up to the 21st Century with software, our busses, keep track of our inventory and to make sure that we are using everything as efficiently as we can. It will also help us when we go before the City Council if we had better data. Likewise in regards to our facilities, we have a bond which hopefully will be passed in the fall and at that point we make sure we have a manager to help us facilitate that and make sure it goes the way it is suppose to go. In addition to the fact, the day to day operations, you are talking of 1000’s of square feet of building that needs to be monitored and I need someone who will go out to the buildings every single day. I have been going out to them since the beginning of August, walking the buildings and I can recognize a dust bunny like the best of them but I need someone with more skills than I am in buildings. We really need to take a look at that. If you look at the two job descriptions before you, you will see they are very detailed. I would like to thank Ray Votto for that. I would like you to consider restructuring that department into two separate entities. Both Ray and I did our research, we looked the current literature in regards to both jobs and we feel that both of these job descriptions quantifies the qualifications and skills of the disposition of the individual who should be running this department. They need to be well versed in

the laws and regulations and also organization skills and technology skills so that we can track work orders, track timeliness of work orders and make sure that we are using our employees efficiently. What are your thoughts?

Mr. Traficante stated that he agrees totally with the separation of the positions.

Dr. Lundsten stated that she would asked the Committee to look at both of these job descriptions as all of you bring a different prospective to the table on these as you all work in different parts of the employment sector. Ray and I looked at them carefully but there may be something that we missed.

Redflex Student Guardian

Dr. Lundsten presented on this topic (See “Handout A” on file in the Superintendent’s Office).

Dr. Lundsten stated that earlier in the Spring we had a representative come out from the Student Guardian program and we have a representative here tonight. This is the program that puts controls on the bus that record someone passing the bus when the stop sign is out. If you remember you approved a pilot. I am going to let the representative from Student Guardian speak tonight and answer your questions. We did a survey and we saw a significant passes on two

of the busses. We picked routes that might have a problem and Student Guardian did a really nice job in regards to passing and did an analysis on the data. For instance on bus no. 19 they monitored it for 7 days, did 243 stops. There were 5 morning violations and 1 evening violation, which was significant. On another bus run there were 13 days and there were 8 cars that passed the bus when the arm was out. Both were on side roads, two way traffic, and a low traffic volume, which is scary. We would like to move forward with this. I know you had some concerns. We didn't have an issue with this to be putting them on every bus, but we will be putting them on some busses. We have a representative to answer your questions on how we can move forward.

Dana Meinke asked if the Committee had any questions as to how the analysis was put together?

Mr. Traficante asked who selected the routes?

Dana Meinke stated that she worked with Joel to select them. We took their suggestions on which busses they would anticipate to have a high volume of violations. We installed temporary cameras that recorded nothing but traffic when the stop arm is out. You can see how many days of data we have for each bus. How many stops there were total and of those stops, how many violations. The national average of violations is 1 bus gets passed every 2 days. Based on the data here, I would propose taken advantage of these two buses

getting this system on them.

Dr. Lundsten stated that this is part of a bigger issue of safety.

Mrs. Ruggieri asked what the cost is of putting a full system on 2 busses.

Dana Meinke for every citation that is issued, a portion of that money goes to the municipality and a portion comes to the vendor. In summary, the cost to you is nothing.

Mrs. Ruggieri stated that the problem is the money going to the municipality does not go to us. We also own our own busses. There might not be an impact, but we won't see that money.

Dana Meinke stated that there is no financial gain from what I have seen, but there is a great technology tool that you are able to install on your busses for no cost.

Mrs. Ruggieri asked if there would ever be a cost to us?

Dana Meinke stated never.

Mrs. Culhane stated that it is said there is never a cost so you are giving us this equipment for free and not expecting any funds in return? How do you get paid?

Dana Meinke stated through the citations.

Mr. Balducci stated that when he and the Superintendent met with them, they are not the only ones in town that provide this service. That was a question that I asked and other districts who use this, some just secured their services outright and some went through an RFP. I would like to out this through and RFP process. Providence happens to be one of them so I will contact my colleague in Providence and ask for a copy of their RFP. Again, the Superintendent wanted to find out from you if you wanted to move forward with this project.

Mrs. Ruggieri stated that if the larger picture is student safety and making our busses safer, then this is something we should be doing.

Mr. Traficante asked what the State percentage is?

Dana Meinke stated that 12 ½ % stays with the State, 12 ½ stays with the municipalities and 75% comes back to the vendor. They are \$300-500 fines, at the police discretion. All the police that we are working with are writing tickets for the \$500 as they feel that this is an egregious offense.

Mrs. Culhane asked what other municipalities you are working with have agreements with their towns or cities?

Dana Meinke stated that she do not know.

Ms. Iannazzi stated that Mr. Analdo told her that Johnston has an agreement where the Mayor gives the money to the School Department.

Mrs. Culhane stated that she thinks this is a great idea and if this is going to help with the safety of our students, then I am all for it. I have an issue with the City being funded off of our backs.

Ms. Iannazzi asked if she would like to have a conversation with the mayor?

Dr. Lundsten stated that her and Stephanie can go over and she has no problem with that.

Mrs. Culahne stated that was a great idea.

Plant/Transportation Staffing Plan

Mr. Raymond Votto spoke briefly on this topic. See Handout "B" and "C" on file in the Superintendent's office for further information.

AIA Agreement between Saccoccio & Associates, Inc. and the Cranston School Committee

Mr. Raymond Votto spoke on this topic. See handout “D” on file with the Superintendent’s office for further information

Adjourn Public Work Session

A motion to adjourn was made by Mr. Traficante; seconded by Mr. Gale. All were in favor. The meeting was adjourned at 7:17 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Andrea Iannazzi, Chairperson

** **

**CRANSTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS
FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT (REVISED)
CUSTODIANS
2014 - 2017**

**(ANNUAL INCREMENTAL BUDGET CHANGES FROM
PREVIOUS YEAR)**

CATEGORY 2014-2015 2015-2016 2016-2017 TOTALS

RAISE (A) & (C)	78,079	TBD	TBD	78,079
STEPS (B)	34,091	25,022	23,171	82,284
SALARIES (C)	38,504	38,872	39,211	116,587
LONGEVITY (C)	(38,504)	(40,332)	(40,671)	(119,507)
PENSION	12,630	2,653	2,445	17,728
FICA	6,955	1,461	1,346	9,761
MEDICARE	1,626	342	315	2,283
	133,381	28,018	25,817	187,215

of raises,

The above excludes the costs
if awarded, in FYE 2016 and FYE
2017.

ASSUMPTIONS

(A) - RAISE

2014-2015 = 3%

2015-2016 = Re-Opener

2016-2017 = Re-Opener

(B) - STEP MOVEMENT ALL 3 YEARS

**CRANSTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS
FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT (REVISED)
CUSTODIANS
2015 - 2017**

**(ANNUAL INCREMENTAL BUDGET CHANGES FROM
PREVIOUS YEAR)**