

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

Board of Trustees

Minutes of the Regular Meeting

November 04, 2010

Minutes were approved at the December 1, 2010 Board meeting.

I. Routine

A. **Call Meeting to Order**

At 8:10 a.m., Dr. James Segovis, Chairperson, called the meeting to order.

B. **Roll Call of the Board**

Davies' Executive Assistant called the roll of the Board.

Members Present: Richard Beaupre; Raymond Chartier; Robert Boisselle; Lawrence Gemma; Carolyn Hebert; Carolyn Kyle, *Vice-Chairperson*; Paul Ouellette; John Quinn
Dr. James Segovis, *Chairperson*;

Members Absent: Robert Halkyard; John Nardolillo; Robin Smith

Others Present: Victoria A. Gailliard-Garrick; Cheryl Carroll; B. Blumenthal;
Joanne Andrews; Gerry Manning; Susan Paquin; Susan Tierney;
Scott Conley

C. **Approval of Minutes**

*A motion was made to approve the minutes of the October 07, 2010 meeting;
Mr. Boisselle made the motion; Mr. Chartier seconded the motion and all were in
favor.*

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

Recessing into Executive Session was deferred to the end of the agenda.

E. **Opportunity for Audience to Comment**

No comments from the audience.

II. Business Agenda

A. **Finance Report** – Cheryl Carroll, Business Office Coordinator
Report was deferred to Executive Session

B. **Human Resources Report** – Joanne Andrews, H.R. Coordinator
Currently interviewing for a janitor position due to the transfer of a senior janitor and a current janitor promoted to that position. Will be going through a second round of interviews for the Supervisor of Academic Instruction position following this meeting and hopefully should have a decision made soon after that. There is still a pending

certification for an Auto Careers teaching position due to a resignation within the first couple weeks of school.

Dr. Segovis asked about the outsourcing of the janitorial staff from a couple of years ago. It did not come to fruition because it was determined that the cost savings wasn't substantial enough; plus, in the last Council 94 contract, there was a no lay-off clause. However, we did spend a lot of time going through the exercises.

C. **Strategic Planning Report** – *Victoria A. Gailliard-Garrick, Director*

Dr. Segovis mentioned time needs to be spent with the committee to follow through on things. Now that things have settled down, we need to start inviting the legislators so he asked Mr. Ouellette to follow through on that. Mrs. Gailliard-Garrick also shared out with the Department Coordinators the feedback we got from the strategic planning retreat. Overall, they were very pleased with it. They had a lot of great ideas. They realize it is definitely needed in light of the new funding formula.

III. Informational Time/Program Updates

A. **Director's Report**

1) **Davies Teachers' Association** – *Scott Conley, Vice-President*

Mr. Conley had nothing to report.

2) **Davies Teacher Assistants' Association**

No representation present.

Dr. Segovis asked if they have any issues the board should be aware of. Everything seems to be going okay; however, there are issues that we have concerns about; the teachers with the new initiatives coming out of RIDE. Everyone has concerns about them while introducing and implementing some of these new initiatives.

3) **Race-to-the-Top Scope of Work** – *V. Gailliard-Garrick, Director*

This is one of the issues referred to in the above agenda item. Back in July, there was a press conference informing Rhode Islanders that the state was awarded \$75 million dollars in Race-to-the-Top funding. RI was one of 10 states that were awarded the money. To get that money, each district had to submit a report which was based on Transforming RI Education, the Commissioner's strategic plan. With that she rolled out a document called "The Scope of Work", which Mrs. Gailliard-Garrick and her leadership team worked on last week.

The document is basically a tool to organize and manage the scope of work based on the five standards Mrs. Gailliard-Garrick spoke about at the last board meeting: Standards and Curriculum, Instructional Improvement, Educator Effectiveness, Human-Capital Development, School Transformation and Innovation. We have to lay out that plan and provide the activities that we are currently doing; where we are going with those support systems; how are we going to introduce them and roll it out.

She is happy to say that we submitted the scope of work document on October 22nd and we received feedback on it on Nov. 2nd through a webinar with Dave Abbott who is overseeing our region on the scope of work that needs to be completed in this document. She feels very strongly that it was exceptional work.

There were five criteria that they looked at. We met four out of five. The fifth one we knew we were not going to meet because it involved more money. They are looking at Davies as a suburban district and we took issue with that considering 92% of our students are from low income families. They acknowledged it and recognized that we have some issues with the amount of money they are going to give us, \$249,000 out of the \$75 million. The amount of work, for example, in Standards and Curriculum, we have to train our teachers with the new common core standards, the new reading, writing, listening in language, and mathematics skills. They only allowed four staff members to go out and get the training, come back and roll it out to the rest of the staff. This is ridiculous. We need more teachers to go out and look at the standards before they start working on curriculum changes and aligning these new standards.

We had a lot to say in that particular area. They said they were not going to increase Davies' portion of the funding. They will look at discretionary funds. Whatever they are, we are not sure. We are not quite sure how this \$249,000 is going to be rolled out because this document was very vague about the spending of the money.

Other than that we met all the other criteria in the document. A couple of things need to be tweaked. They talked about laying out the activities and then they asked about technical and adaptive challenges and the rationale. An example of a technical challenge would be that the personnel and its related financial constraints for training, etc. An example of an adaptive challenge would be something along the effect of peer monitoring in the evaluation system. They have a new evaluation system for all administrators and teachers. One of the things they are looking at is having peer monitoring meaning having a teacher, a department chair or coordinator go in and be the primary evaluator for a particular teacher in a particular subject they have expertise in. Obviously that is a contractual issue. That is an adaptive type of challenge. We have to determine what challenges are technical and which ones are adaptive, but the most of our technical challenges are the financial constraints.

Ms. Carroll added that the reason for the importance of wanting RIDE to recognize us as an urban serving school is because when you read through the Race-to-the-Top Scope of Work, it makes reference to when you are deemed an urban school, a much, much higher percentage of the staff is funded for these trainings so that you have more staff throughout your building deploying these initiatives and directly involved with them. We felt this was pretty significant, "What are they talking about when 92% of our kids come from urban districts?" They know that but there will be discretionary funds to help us, but naturally we were hoping to get a much greater percentage of our staff involved in these initiatives. We were asked to remove our comments out of the scope of work document and resubmit it.

All the activities in the document are based on state-wide goals that the commissioner and the Board of Regents have set regarding using data to establish benchmarks, e.g., by 2015, they want 90% of 4th and 8th graders to be proficient in mathematics and reading. They want 77% of students statewide to be enrolled and complete at least one year of post-secondary education. These are the types of goals that are set. There is a list of them and we have to look at our current

data and roll out these performance measures by the 2015 mark. We are positioned very well to do this work.

- 4) **Graduation Requirements/Class of 2012** – *V. Gailliard-Garrick, Director*
Changes have been made to the initial 2003 regulations that were amended in 2008. The regulations required that students of the Class 2012 (current juniors) will have to have a “2” on the NECAP testing. There is four different performance measures: Proficient with distinction, proficient, partially proficient, substantially below proficient. This was one of the components of the High School Diploma System. The components are the credits, the NECAP, the multiple measures (Senior Project and Graduation Portfolio). A lot of discussion has been going around the table with RIDE and the Regents regarding this particular class, 2012, and looking at those components to graduate. The biggest concern they have is with the NECAP testing.

Data:

With the Class of 2011; 11,189 juniors that took the test, there were 985 in Reading, 4829 in Math, and 560 in Reading that received a “1”, substantially below proficient on the NECAP testing. If they were looking at that data, all those seniors would not be graduating so they have to go back to the table and decide what is going to be done. They made out new graduation requirements. What they decided to do is add an additional component, “Approval of the Diploma System.” Each LEA had to develop a diploma system so if we have an approval of that fourth component, then the school can offer a three-tiered diploma. The first, the student has to meet all four: the credits, the multiple measures, the NECAP, and the approved diploma system. If the student receives a 3 or a 4, they will receive a Regent’s Diploma. If they receive a “2”, partially proficient, they will receive a RI Diploma. If an LEA did not get their diploma system approved, they will be able to give out a “Local Diploma.” Any student who does not receive a 2 or better, will not receive a diploma. The options are they can come back and do a fifth year to work on the areas they did get proficient based on the NECAP testing, or they can look at an alternative educational setting. That is in draft form right now. This is going to be a major, major concern with parents.

Mr. Chartier asked how our students made out on the NECAP testing. We had one student in Reading who received a “1.” On the writing test, we had three, and on the Math, we had 65. These students had an opportunity to retake the test in October with the current juniors. This data is unavailable at this time.

- 5) **RI Educator Evaluation System** – *V. Gailliard-Garrick, Director*
There is a new evaluation system for all teachers and administrators. The NECAP will be connected to the evaluation system. Currently, they just completed the framework. They are looking at piloting the evaluation system over the course of January to June. It will be implemented in September 2011.

The systems looks at three different areas: student learning looking at student goals; student growth (student achievement, performance measures and outcome, professional practices); and professional responsibility which she hasn’t seen yet and they are all based on rubrics: highly effective, effective, minimally effective, and ineffective. They are struggling with the primary evaluator. That is when the

peer monitoring comes in. Some districts throughout the state do have department coordinators that go in and do evaluations. Her biggest concern is having a peer deem a teacher ineffective causing other issues, grievance, arbitrations, etc. They are looking at complementary evaluators which could be a department chair that could fit within an administrator (have expertise in that area) or they are looking at what they call an ISP, intermediary service providers. They are former superintendents, principals, administrators who would come in and assist in the evaluation process. They are looking at six observations and one formal.

Dr. Segovis asked if we still need union approval/negotiation or is it automatic. The Commissioner is saying it is law as part of the regulations which they are tweaking and will be coming out again soon and that law supersedes any contract. It is a very comprehensive system and it will determine if a teacher gets recertified or not.

Looking back at if students do not meet the graduation programs, they can do a fifth year or go to an alternative education program, Mr. Ouellette asked for an example of what that would be. RIDE is trying to partner with Adult Education looking at adult education programs and providing those skills in those content areas that they were deemed substantially below proficient to bring them along the proficiency requirements. They also said that we can look at other standardized tests other than the NECAP. The test that they mentioned, SAT or PSAT, are much more difficult than the NECAP. They are struggling with this and that is why it is still on the table. They did change the graduation cohort from 4 years to 5 years so if the kid has been here for 4 years and they haven't repeated, it will not be held against the school as a part of meeting the performance targets.

It going to be some challenging times, but we are well respected at RIDE for the work that we do and with the support systems we have put in place.

Dr. Segovis asked how the "Good Teacher" Award, contractual item, coming along. Mrs. Gailliard-Garrick answered that she and Ms. Andrews began looking at it and just put the brakes on it because of this new evaluation system. We can't base it on the new system, we don't have any idea what it is, and we are not comfortable with the old system. It really doesn't measure teacher effectiveness in the classroom the way it should. It is on hold. We didn't award any this year. Dr. Segovis asked if it has to tie into those systems, can it be a system that the Board agrees upon; have the two parties work on something that will work for both sides. We worked hard on getting it into the contract. Ms. Kyle added that we said we would do it so we need to follow through on it. We don't want any problems at the next negotiations because we didn't hold up on our part of the bargain. Keep it simple, easy to administer, while awarding teachers in the best way possible. The Board urged follow through on this but they understand why it was held off.

Dr. Segovis is concerned about the six observations in the classroom when there is no increase in staff to get it done. That is a lot of work. And they are unannounced.

6) Future Student Night – 11/9/10 – V. Gailliard-Garrick, Director

We have around 800 students come in that night with their families and friends to review the school, see what is going on in the technical areas. Mrs. Gailliard-Garrick is interested to see what the numbers are going to look like at this year's event considering this funding formula and see if they are being influenced by their sending districts, Pawtucket in particular. She sees a drastic change in the number of people who come out and review what is going on in this school talking to the teachers. She has some concern because it has always been at least 800 people here on that night.

She does opening remarks in the gymnasium because of the large number of people and the Guidance Chair does them in the Cafetorium. Then they go out and walk around the school to see the technical areas and teachers. Then they have the opportunity to sign up for one of the four entrance exam sessions held on each of the four Saturdays in January.

It is going to be interesting to see the numbers and the sign-ups to determine if they have been influenced. Mrs. Kyle asked how she thinks the districts will influence them. It has always been a concern for any career and technical school. The parents/students are told they won't be able to go to college; they don't have a strong academic program. The guidance counselors have a lot to do with that. This was just a small number of people influencing them but now with the funding formula, they are looking at possible job losses. She foresees this influence will be more wide spread. Guidance counselors, teachers, administrators may be a part of trying to prevent their students from coming here. Mrs. Kyle reminded us that we discussed strategies at the retreat on marketing the school and getting the message out about Davies. The same thing happened to one of her Gateway schools in Cranston. Enrollment went from about 50 down to 10. Part of the school had to be closed, while still accommodating the needs of those 10, but all the infrastructure of that school had to be addressed. They have certainly seen that trend for a few years now with the districts still not wanting to send their kids. It is interesting to see that Davies is going through that now but not all districts at all can replicate what Davies offers.

In October, Mr. Chartier read that CCRI reported Davies being the 3rd best high school in the state with Davies graduates entering the freshmen year not needing remedial courses. The top two high schools are Classical and South Kingstown. Davies is the fifth highest school when you add in the private high schools with Hendricken and LaSalle. Academically, Pawtucket is saying their kids are going to college, but 68% of Tolman's graduates need remedial courses and 75% from Shea. Davies is at 46% so we are doing substantially a much better job.

How do the parents learn about this event? We have an outreach and awareness program where the guidance counselors go out to the junior high schools during the entire month of October and a few days in November. They go to every middle school in our sending districts with the exception of Providence. We talked a little about this at the retreat. Mr. Slemon's suggestion was we need to start sending our students out. Then Mr. Blumenthal puts a news release in the local newspapers.

7) Building and Construction Trades Program Status Report – Gerry Manning, Supervisor of Technical Instruction

(See Supplemental Material: “Program Design—Building and Construction)

Everyone is aware that last summer we were making the transition from the traditional carpentry program to a building – construction trades program. As such, we were looking for a person to come in and take over that program that had the required certification. The importance of that is that person can do residential carpentry but also bring in a number of other areas that tie into that construction such as masonry, electrical, plumbing, HVAC. As such, we brought Mr. Esser back who has the building/construction trades certification. We are really in our infancy of reinventing the program. The handout is a program design that Mr. Manning came up with this summer based on his own limited expertise. He asked Mr. Esser to look at his program description for the next advisory board meeting in December and to add some of what his vision is and do whatever editing that needs to take place to make it a holistic Davies view based on his expertise.

They had an initial meeting on September 1st to talk about the program design; to present this document; and to talk about the direction of where the program is going. They had five members at that meeting including Mr. Boisselle and Mr. Chartier. Not to have the board of trustees overloaded on the advisory board, but he thinks Mr. Gemma would be a great addition on that board looking holistically at the building and construction trades having the plumbing/HVAC perspective. As we move two-four years down the road, Mr. Manning’s vision is to have a building and construction trade program which has instructors in each of those key areas and to move from an on-site, project-based program to an off-site, construction of a home, refurbishing structures, garage, a facility based program.

Discussion took place at the initial meeting about some of those non-profits, Blackstone Valley, Habitat of Humanity, some of those types of organizations. Last year they had a meeting and RIBA talked about having an off-site that they can supply us with to do new construction for the next 15 years. With the economy the way it is and based on some of the information that came out of our first advisory board meeting last month, we may have to rethink our action plan.

There is a student on the advisory board and he was able to hear the concerns of some of the contractors that are out there and what their struggles are just to stay ahead of the economy, keep food on the table, to keep people employed, having qualified help that they can rely on and not have to be at every single site while the construction is going on. It was great to have a student hear that perspective and bring that perspective back to the students.

At this time, we will be having a second advisory board and what Mr. Esser has done up until this time is he has elected two student representatives to be a part of the advisory board. He has also taken his senior students and gave them a supervisory role who will supervise mini-job crews made up of juniors and sophomores. Initially he has been going through some small structure projects (gazeboes, sheds) for each of those crews starting with the foundation so they can go from the sill up so they can get a perspective of what the skill sets are that they are going to need when they go to the off-site type of construction.

We are looking for the advisory board construction leaders to be able to come in and do some workshops/presentations in the classroom and also to be able to bring our students out to some job sites to get that first-hand experience.

It is only in its infancy, but that is where the program is moving towards. We are hoping to have advisory board meetings once a month to get the movement going in the right direction and then maybe after that, every other month or as needed. Most advisories meet two or three times a year. Right now they are accelerating that a little bit to get this process going. Timelines have been talked about that Mr. Esser is following for the program design looking at a 2011/2012 off-site construction start time.

Mrs. Kyle, while she thinks the holistic vision for the program is wonderful, she asked Mr. Manning was he planning to accommodate that vision by bringing in contractors from the community, i.e., advisory board, or was he going to have to bring staff on site with the current budget constraints. Right now, because Mr. Esser has the certification, we are looking at the carpentry end of it at this time, but he can still introduce electrical, plumbing, masonry based on his certification. Until we expand the program to the vision (off-site), Blackstone Valley, Habitat of Humanity will be the contractors where we will only be doing the carpentry piece of it. They will sub-contract all the other pieces out until we build the program to where we have the different instructors in place.

In addressing Mrs. Kyle's concern about the budget with additional staff, Mrs. Gailliard-Garrick added that we already have three teachers in the Electrical Program but with the other trades such as plumbing and HVAC, we would have to look at that as well as transportation back and forth from the sites. We are not at that point yet, but obviously we will have to look at that creatively.

Mr. Gemma asked about classroom space because we are talking about four different trades. Mrs. Gailliard-Garrick believes she has the foresight to look ahead at these issues. Currently we have twelve programs, but based on whatever the new CTE regs. look like, the state is going to look at downsizing some of these technical areas that do not fit in their plan for economic growth. What careers are going to feed RI's workforce? At this point, she is looking at some of the things and moving some of the people around in some of these programs. So hopefully we can put together this Building and Construction Trades program based on that. A perfect example right now is the Information Technology and the HIT we talked about at the retreat, Health Information Technology. She has two programs that are just not getting the numbers in there and the performance outcomes in one of them just isn't good. She is looking at combining some of those programs, meaning cutting them down, and doing some research looking at that HIT model and there are some secondary schools that are doing the HIT. She is looking at taking Business Tech and combining it with Health Careers. Those are the type of things that are coming, so that space availability, she will have the space after she does the research. It is just in the early stages, but she is looking at these types of things just for survival purposes.

Dr. Segovis said to Mr. Manning that he sees him providing the board with a report on the next phase and with a set of recommendations for the board to

approve. The way he sees it is we are going with carpentry construction with a minor move to the other areas.

8) Other – V. Gailliard-Garrick, Director

—IT Partnership with CCRI—At last month’s board meeting, two representatives from CCRI presented to the board the plan to run conduit lines along Davies property to enhance their IT capabilities and what the advantages are to Davies. Mrs. Gailliard-Garrick introduced Susan Tierney, Davies IT Coordinator, to give the Board her perspective of the plan.

CCRI has approached Davies about laying some conduits along the school’s land so they could gain an alternate access point for their Internet needs. After having the land surveyed, they feel the best option for them is to come off of Jenckes Hill Road. That would entail them coming across our land.

In order to make the agreement a little more amendable to Davies, they agreed to give us something in return. They decided to give us a couple of strands of fiber. This will require some discussion to work out the details so she will need to sit down with Mrs. Gailliard-Garrick at some point. They also said they will give us some server space in this disaster recovery room that doesn’t exist yet. There may be some cost to us. She doesn’t know what that is yet. They are laying the foundation for us to take advantage of this opportunity, but what she assuming what they are going to do is just have dock fiber in place meaning the fiber isn’t lit up. If we want to use this fiber, then there are going to be costs associated with that and we will have to discuss who will be expected to pay for those costs. It is an excellent opportunity for a disaster recovery plan but again we need to discuss what that is going to look like, but to make it actually functioning, we will have to talk about who will be expected to pay for the services.

She has a pretty good idea of what the costs will be based on what we currently pay for our Internet access. Right now we have a 5 MB bandwidth with 10 MB sustainable. That is about \$12,000 a year but because we are eligible for E-Rate which is an 80% discount, we only pay 20% of that cost which is about \$4000 per year. Now whether CCRI is also eligible for E-rate, she does not know for certain because a big portion of E-rate funding is determined on your free and reduced lunch numbers; does post-secondary qualify for that? That gives you an idea of what it would cost to actually light up the fiber and take advantage of it. The cost will be less if we just use that fiber as a data backup in their disaster recovery room.

—December Meeting: Mr. Beaupre was unable to secure the Kirkbrae for December 6th so the December meeting was moved to Wednesday, December 1st.

—Trustees Nominations: Mr. Andrew Brown’s nomination was approved by the Board; awaiting his resume to send to the Board of Regents’ for their approval. In the meantime, Mr. Beaupre informed the board that Carlos Ferreira declined.

IV. 15-Minutes of Strategic Thinking

No discussion took place.

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

Issues to be discussed in Executive Session was deferred until the December meeting since they did not require any voting.

V. Adjournment

At 9:32 a.m., Dr. Segovis asked for a motion to adjourn and all were in favor.