

WILLIAM M. DAVIES, JR. CAREER AND TECHNICAL HIGH SCHOOL
50 Jenckes Hill Road, Lincoln, RI 02865

Board of Trustees

Minutes of the Regular Meeting

Tuesday, June 12, 2007

Minutes were approved at the November 7, 2007 Board Meeting.

I. Routine

A. **Call Meeting to Order**

At 8:08 am, Dr. Segovis called the meeting to order.

B. **Roll Call of the Board**

Davies' Executive Assistant called the roll of the Board.

Members Present: Richard Beaupre; James Bone; V. Michael Ferdinandi; Larry Gemma; John Gregory; Robert Halkyard; Carolyn Kyle, *Vice-Chairperson*; Dr. James Segovis, *Chairperson*; Robin Smith; Lornette Uthman

Members Absent: Harvey Simms

Others Present: Victoria A. Gailliard-Garrick, Cheryl Carroll, Susan Paquin, Joanne Andrew

C. **Recess to Executive Session Pursuant to R.I.G.L. 42.46-5 (A) (1) and (2) to Discuss Pending Litigation and Personnel Issues**

At 8:09, Dr. Segovis asked for a motion to recess into Executive Session. Mr. Gregory made the motion to recess into Executive Session pursuant to R. I. G. L. 42.46-5 (A) (1) and (2) to discuss pending litigation and personnel issues. Mr. Halkyard seconded the motion and all were in favor.

D. **Return to Regular Session**

At 8:15 am, Dr. Segovis asked for a motion to return to Regular Session; Mr. Gregory made the motion; Mr. Halkyard seconded the motion; and all were in favor.

Mr. Halkyard made a motion to seal the minutes of the Executive Session; Mr. Gregory seconded the motion; and all were in favor.

Let the record show: No vote was taken during the Executive Session. There was just a general discussion of personnel and litigation issues.

E. **Opportunity for Audience to Comment**

No audience present.

II. Business Agenda

- A. **Teacher Non-Renewal Hearing Pursuant to R. I. L. G. 16-13-4 and 16-45-6 (g)** –
Victoria A. Gailliard-Garrick, Director
(See Supplemental Materials: Three letters from Mr. John DeCubellis, Jr., Esq.)
This hearing was postponed by Mr. DeCubellis, the attorney from NEARI, until further notice until which time the enrollment #s can be reassessed.
- B. **Board of Trustees' By-laws** – *Dr. James Segovis, Chairperson*
(See Supplemental Material: Board of Trustees By-Laws)

ARTICLE II: Membership; Section 3: Selection and Term

In 2005, the Board had a long discussion about the by-laws resulting with several different proposals. One was to create a three-year term and have a year off in between terms. This proposal was never passed and now it's a mute point. Do we want to set terms? Currently we have a natural turnover. The issue may be more one of continuity. Also what remains in the by-laws is: "*Trustees members representing parents must have a child enrolled during his/her tenure or may remain on the Board for up to three years following their child's graduation;*" therefore, Mrs. Uthman's term will expire on June 30th. We will thank Mrs. Uthman for her term of office. We will need a parent replacement for her. The nominating committee will do another review of that plus look for a student graduate that will be appropriate for serving on the Board.

Dr. Segovis asked if we see a need for terms or do we keep the by-laws the same. Mr. Halkyard mentioned that historically, people have been appointed for three years unless they were filling somebody's unexpired term. This is more practice than the by-laws. Do we want to maintain that as a practice or put it in writing? Mr. Gregory feels we should have something in writing. You lose some continuity, but than also never bring in any new blood. Any organization dealing with a board struggles with that especially with a board of this type. It's not so much term limits because there is a natural evolution. He recommends keeping the unlimited three-year terms meaning not having the year off between terms. The practice is members are assigned one of the three 3-year terms depending when they came on the board or if they were replacing an unexpired term.

Mr. Ferdinandi suggested putting in writing that the practice is going to be a 3-year term, but if we find a really good board member who can only commit to one year up front to see if it works for them, are we boxing in ourselves by adhering to the 3-year term? Mr. Gregory does have a provision for that in his board's by-laws. That's an excellent point.

Dr. Segovis asked if we should put down a term of three years or fewer at the discretion of the Board. Mr. Halkyard pointed out that currently is says that the Board of Regents will determine the term of office, but they have never done it. Mr. Gregory suggested continuing with what we have been doing in practice rather than writing it down and putting us in the box inadvertently.

All were in agreement to keep the practice and keep the by-laws the same in this section.

ARTICLE III; Officers and Duties

In 2005, there was a discussion on a second vice-chairperson. In reality, the board wasn't strongly enamored one way or the other and Dr. Segovis recommended that this issue be dropped. All agreed.

ARTICLE IV: Meetings; Section 8, Voting

Each trustee shall be entitled to one vote. Voting by proxy shall not be permitted for any purpose. This is the old way. The proposal: every member is entitled to one vote at a meeting or express consent without a meeting may authorize another person to act for them by proxy. No proxy shall be valid after eleven months. This is a radical change. This will not hold true for a hearing. Most boards you have to be present physically. The purpose of this recommendation was because of attendance issues. Dr. Segovis recommended that we don't follow through on this proposal. It could cause a rippling effect with other issues. All were in favor.

ARTICLE IV: Meetings; Section 10. Minutes of Meetings

This section will be rewritten to reflect the modern electronic media in that the new open meeting laws mandate that the agenda and minutes of meetings must be made public by posting on the RI Secretary State's website. *Dr. Segovis asked for a motion to change this section, Mr. Beaupre made the motion; Mr. Gregory seconded the motion, and all were in favor.* By-laws will be revised to reflect this change.

C. Approval of the Davies Wellness Policy – Cheryl Carroll, Business Office Coordinator

(See Supplemental Material: "Davies Wellness Policy")

This drafted policy was distributed at the May board meeting. Davies is required to adopt such policy by September 1, 2007. A committee was formed at Davies that consisted of Ms. Carroll, the school nurse who was our in-house guru on these regulations and standards, the school's cafeteria on-site Chartwells director, and the Culinary teachers. They drafted what they thought met the General Assembly's new standards for snacks, beverages and physical activity within the school building.

The policy dictates what will be stocked in the vending machines, the guidelines for the cafeteria's food service, encourages physical activity, and states what the minimum guidelines are for physical activity time spent in Phys. Ed. class. It states that we will *encourage* physical activity because outside of Phys. Ed. class, we cannot force people to walk two miles, e.g., and exercise. We will promote an environment that encourages such. Soda will no longer be stocked in our vending machines and there will be limited fat content snacks that will be offered here.

An exclusion was written into the policy with regard to the food on the Culinary Arts side. We felt we couldn't teach a school program that teaches kids to be future chefs limiting them to such stringent guidelines.

Limited carbonated beverages means it could be carbonated waters, for example. She was initially going with diet soda but Pepsi, our new vendor, wrote the contract eliminating all carbonated beverages. A big by-product of the vending machines is the revenue supports our athletic booster activities. Juices are okay. Drinks with 30 grams of sugar could be worse.

The Board recommended adding the sport drinks such as Powerade, Gatorade, energy drinks. Ms. Carroll will add them in providing they meet the General Assembly's guidelines for healthier beverages in schools. The Dept. of Education is reacting to what is coming down the pike with the General Assembly; working in tandem.

Ms. Smith does not support the diet sodas because they really are not good for you. She would prefer there be milk, water, fruit juices, because you will find the students will gorge themselves on the diet sodas if they were made available along with the healthier beverages. Diet sodas would be the product of choice. Dr. Segovis also added that research shows that false sugar rushes creates more cravings vs. a natural sugar which leads to a better dietary cycle. Ms. Carroll firmly believes that when you are thirsty you will buy the healthy drinks that are available. People do conform and adopt change.

This is exactly the type of feedback Ms. Carroll wanted because it is a policy that has to be accepted by the Board.

With the changes suggested: there is to be no carbonated, diet soft drinks and sport drinks may be added but with clarification as not to have a high sugar content, Dr. Segovis asked for a motion to approve the Davies Wellness Policy. Mr. Gregory made the motion to approve the Davies Wellness Policy with the noted changes. Mr. Halkyard seconded the motion. All were in favor.

D. **Approval Strategic Plan 2007-2010/School Improvement Plan 06-08** – Victoria A. Gailliard-Garrick, Director

This agenda item led to a very enlightening discussion at the June 6th Board meeting. The Director distributed some model mission statements from other career and tech centers. She then walked the Board through the drafted Strategic Plan document. This is a plan that will hopefully begin to be implemented in Sept. 07. This document provides a plan, guidance, and strategies to implement the school improvement process.

—**The Table of Contents**, the Board received an updated copy that reflects the additions to the plan.

—**The Introduction** provides the rationale for a strategic plan which is to meet the mandates of the NCLB and nation-wide school reform. The purpose is to execute change that enhances the academic foundation and the efficiency of the school as it relates to teaching and learning. The goal of the SP is to provide a platform for change and the elements needed to implement school-wide educational reform initiatives.

—**The Executive Summary** will be provided by Dr. Segovis.

—**The Mission Statement**, a lengthy discussion took place at the June 6th meeting on what a MS should be; what the model is; what the rubric is, etc. across the state. She provided the board with copies of MSs within the high schools in Davies region along with Warwick's Career and Tech Center. They all basically say the same thing in one or two sentences. Dr. Segovis found two highlighted differences. Warwick C&T's MS is that they will provide students with entry level career skills, and Pawtucket's states he "significant economic and infrastructure challenges." Dr. Segovis asked if everyone was comfortable with the way the Davies' MS is written once the Philosophy and Goals were added making it tight and more pointed.

—**The Board of Trustees Membership list** identifies who the trustees are.

—**The School Improvement Team list** identifies who the 15 members are. Right now there are seven vacancies of which four will be filled soon. Five students for three seats will be interviewed. They had to submit a letter of intent on why they wanted to be a part of the School Improvement Team, how they saw that team. One parent is going to be

part of the team as of Sept. 07. This leaves us with three vacancies: one parent, a business partner, and a community partner. A community partner is someone who might be involved in social services or community organizations such as Progreso (sp?) Latino. Someone from this organization would be advantageous in assisting with some of the diversity that was mentioned during the MS discussion and would address the regulations. Mr. Gregory asked for a copy of the regulations because he sits on their board, their CEO sits on his board, and he thinks they will welcome the opportunity. Dr. Segovis suggested also the assistant director at the SPDC, Adrianna who is a strong candidate if you can't get someone from Progreso Latino.

—**Philosophy and Goals** have been added as a result of the Mission Statement discussion at the last meeting. They outline how the school will implement the strategies that are being defined, and it outlines how we are going to accomplish the school mission.

—**The Vision Statement** establishes a standard and expectation for academic preparation and technical education for the school. Down the road, Dr. Segovis would like to see, now that we are at the top of heap in terms of our rating with the state, and the vision should continue that, but a larger vision would be to become nationally recognized and ranked. This is his vision to move to another level and what would that take?

—**Goals of the Strategic Plan:** To provide a strategic plan that facilitates the school improvement process; to provide a flexible document that addresses the emerging trends and needs in an ever-changing educational environment; provide persistent guidance and direction to each sub-committee during the development and implementation process; to assist in transforming the culture and environment toward educational excellence and life-long learning.

—**Strategies:** To establish a school improvement team that is concert with RI law which will provide leadership and guidance toward meeting the school's mission and vision; to provide support and directions to the sub-committee chairs to ensure the goals and performance indicators outlined in both the Strategic Plan and the School Improvement Plan are achieved; to provide professional development opportunities to staff in an effort to support strategic development and planning initiatives.

—**Six Sub-committees (Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment; Community Public Relations; Grants; Health and Safety; School Structures; Technology):** Each committee has a chair who makes up five members of the School Improvement Team, all teachers. Each committee is charged with the goals and strategies that will improve and enhance the educational environment. School Structures' charge addresses the teaching environment as well as meeting the state mandates in the reform initiatives that are required by the State like the High School Regulations, the new Davies High School Diploma System, and the graduation by proficiency requirement in the six core content areas. The Health and Safety committee's charge is putting together an emergency service plan, a crisis intervention plan that is warranted throughout the state and part of the NEASC recommendations as well. The Community and Public Relations deals with parent engagement, getting parents involved with the school and doing some internal and external types of communication to get more stakeholders involved in the school. Each sub-committee has their own MS, goals and action plans.

The Director asked the Board to take the Strategic Plan document, read and absorb it at their leisure, come back in September to ask any questions. Some of the sub-committees are editing their action plans so there is still some time to vote on the acceptance of the plan. Dr. Segovis sees this as a dialogue in making sure our expectations are clear and the staff is clear with us, but also, it is an on-going working document that he doesn't

want to see ending up on someone's shelf. The Board will be talking with people either through a strategic meeting or throughout the year about where we are on the outcomes.

If the Board has any critiques, hand them into the Director and she will see that they get incorporated into the plan in time for the next meeting. The Board appreciates her and the School Improvement Team's efforts and we affirm the direction of the document. The Board is satisfied with everything in the document.

Davies had to provide for the NEASC site-visit as well as for the Dept. of Ed. the Davies Learning Expectations. This has been added to the Strategic Plan as well. Mr. Ferdinandi asked about "demonstrate mathematical and technical competency", where is competency in reading and writing? As part of the High School Regs, every school district has to develop a High School Diploma System. Within that system, there are state and local assessments. We have an in-house local assessment that is basically looking at the six core content areas (English, math, science, social studies, arts, technology) and the technical training program. They are in the process of developing a local assessment based on the content areas; therefore, kids would have to show a demonstration of proficiency in that content area based on different criteria. For instance, a research paper is required in every content area in the school. There is a school wide rubric on research as well as on writing and oral presentation. This will demonstrate a proficiency in writing. The Senior Project which is a school-wide requirement in meeting the Performance-based Graduation Requirements also has to demonstrate writing and the finished project that is based on the technical area will be an indication if they are meeting their math proficiencies. Then there is certain other testing that you can look at, the new NECAP testing, which is going to be looking for proficiency requirements that these students will have to meet. With the whole diploma system, you have to meet the Carnegie Units and demonstrate these proficiencies so we have various assessment types, content area-wide and school-wide, and rubrics that will measure the assessments.

We are moving ahead. It is a major, major undertaking that is going on. There is an individual learning plan that every student has to have that pretty much covers three domains, academic which is part of the learning expectations and how we are going to get there; there is a social domain and a career domain. It is quite a task in moving these students toward proficiency and to have them prepared to graduate with proficiency and move on to post-secondary education.

Davies developed the template for the Individualized Learning Plan [ILP] and is being used as the exemplar throughout the state. The Guidance Counselors as well as the advisors will work on completing these plans for every student. They and the students monitor the plans. There has to be some sense of responsibility on the part of the students to take charge of their own lives here at the school with some guidance with a lot of different support staff members. When students come in to Davies, they are supposed to come with their plans from the middle school level, but some schools are not doing it.

What is going to happen if the students do not meet those proficiencies and don't graduate especially when meeting with irate parents? As part of the Commissioner's Review, there is a component that talks about policy. The school is in the process of putting together a policy on an appeals process. This needs to be approved by RIDE. She is able to tell who will be able to meet these proficiencies based on benchmarks from their incoming test scores and the state assessment test scores. Currently about 30% probably will have some difficulty meeting those proficiency requirements. They are the

English Language Learners and the Special Needs students. This is why when you are developing programs and course offerings we have the ramp-up programs that have been wonderful in our 9th and 10th grades along with the block scheduling. The students will have the opportunity to stay in school until they meet the proficiencies. The NCLB is nationwide and what other states are doing may look different to what RI is doing, but RI is in the forefront in a lot of the initiatives.

Dr. Segovis asked for the executive summary of the NEASC report. He thanked everyone for being at the meeting not knowing what was going to happen with the hearing and the by-laws. Mr. Ferdinandi asked if this time of day is better for people. Mrs. Kyle recalls Mr. Ragosta mentioning that the public may have trouble attending the meetings if held in the morning, but 5:00 pm for them can't be any easier. Dr. Segovis will talk with Mr. Ragosta even if we give them proper notice. They are not coming now.

IV. Adjournment:

At 9:03 am, Dr. Segovis asked for a motion to adjourn. Mr. Gregory made the motion and Mr. Beaupre seconded the motion. All were in favor.

V. Next Meeting:

September 5, 2007