

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

Board of Trustees

Minutes of the Regular Meeting

January 6, 2011

Minutes were approved at the February 10, 2011 Board meeting.

I. Routine

A. **Call Meeting to Order**

At 8:14 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: Robert Boisselle; Raymond Chartier; Lawrence Gemma; Carolyn Hebert; Carolyn Kyle, *Vice-Chairperson*; Paul Ouellette; Dr. James Segovis, *Chairperson*; Robin Smith

Members Absent: Richard Beaupre; Robert Halkyard; John Nardolillo; John Quinn

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

C. **Approval of Minutes**

A motion was made to approve the minutes of the December 1, 2010 meeting; Mr. Ouellette made the motion; Mr. Gemma 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**

There was no need to recess into Executive Session.

E. **Opportunity for Audience to Comment**

No comments from the audience.

F. **Introduction of Ann Palmer, Davies' new Supervisor of Academic Instruction – V. Gailliard-Garrick, Director**

With great pleasure, after almost two years, the Director introduced Ms. Palmer who started on December 19th. Ms. Palmer has over 25 years of teaching experience as a certified English/Social Studies teacher as well as an administrator in four different states: RI, MA, NC, and TX. She spent the last two years as a vice-principal at a career and technical high school in Dighton/Rehoboth, MA. Davies is her third career and tech appointment. She brings a lot of knowledge and experience regarding career and tech education and has held similar leadership roles. Her primary position here is going to be looking at curriculum, instruction, and assessment. She has been meeting and speaking with most of our management team members and academic teachers who she will be

supervising. The Director is very happy and very pleased to have Ms. Palmer here. We are now in a good position to start continuing to move the school forward.

II. Business Agenda

A. Finance Report – Cheryl Carroll, Business Office Coordinator

There was nothing this month to report on. Next month will be the time for discussion on the budget for the upcoming school year. Ms. Carroll deferred her report until next month's meeting for a more at length discussion.

B. Human Resources Report – Joanne Andrews, H.R. Coordinator

There was nothing to report on. There are no vacancies and no grievances. Everything is going pretty well.

III. Informational Time/Program Updates

A. Director's Report

1) Davies Teachers' Association

Mr. Scott Conley, Vice President of the Teachers' Assoc. had nothing to report.

Dr. Segovis asked him what the reactions are to the proposals from RIDE such as the new teacher evaluation system. He answered that they are still working on it; the next meeting is January 31st for the rubric. They are currently editing the draft that the Director just received. It is pretty comprehensive. Then they are going to field test it in four communities.

Mr. Conley heard the General Assembly is going to look at how career and tech is going to be funded under the new funding formula—the Career and Tech categorical funding. They will be looking at what it is going to actually look like. Dr. Segovis asked if we would get support from them for Davies at the state level (the funding formula being changed for us). Mr. Conley couldn't answer that question. From the state-level, union perspective, yes, because they are always supportive of more funding going toward education, but there is a \$300 million deficit.

2) Davies Teacher Assistants' Association

No representation present.

3) RIDE Initiatives – V. Gailliard-Garrick, Director

As you know, the new Commissioner developed a strategic plan and some of the initiatives in that plan have been incorporated into the Race-to-the-Top application. She has three primary areas that are going to impact what we do here at Davies: the RI Educator Evaluation System, the Common Core Standards and a change in the state assessment testing. The Director presented executive summaries on those three initiatives. Dr. Segovis would like the entire document mailed to the Board at a later time.

a) RI's Educator Evaluation System:

It is going to be a system that is going to provide consistency across the state in evaluating teachers. It is based on multiple measures and every teacher whether they are tenured or non-tenured, will be evaluated annually. In the past, non-tenured teachers were evaluated twice a year

and tenured teachers were evaluated every three years. This new system changes it to every single year for both groups. There are three components within the system: 1) multiple measures of student learning, 2) professional practices, and 3) professional responsibility.

Looking at the every-year, annual evaluation, there are going to be three formal conferences. There will be one in the beginning of the school year (Sept-Oct). During that timeframe the trained evaluators will sit with teachers and set goals for student academic growth. All their goals will pertain to the student. They are also going to look at measurement. How are they going to assess those goals? They are also going to develop a professional development plan. During the second conference (Jan.-Feb.), they will review/revisit and give feedback to that teacher which will also include modifying the goals and PD plan.

Who are the evaluators? There will be two different types of evaluators: primary which will be the administrators who are certified to do teacher evaluations; and complementary type of evaluators who will be determined by RIDE. They have a group of people that they call ISPs, Intermediary Service Providers who are former superintendents, principals, etc. who will come in and do evaluations as well. They are also looking at department coordinators as potential evaluators.

The third conference will happen at the end of the year (May-June), the final feedback and a grade will be determined at that time.

First component—Multiple measures of student learning

They are looking at three assessments to determine growth: the *state assessment testing* (NECAP or the new PARCC); *district assessments* (Stanford Diagnostic Test or common tasks), and *local assessments* (teacher created). Using the model for measuring student learning growth which she is not familiar with yet, at certain periods, they will be looking at student data from the state assessment testing. With this new state assessment testing (PARCC), students will be tested from grades 5 through 11, four times a year, in English Language Arts and Mathematics. They will be able to look at that data from grades 5-11 and look at student growth in performance and outcomes. The testing will be administered on-line and one of the challenges she added in the Race-to-the-Top Scope of Work was having enough computer stations for this testing; however, it will provide us with instantaneous feedback pertaining to diagnostic information relative to student learning and growth and curriculum effectiveness.

The first and second portion of the testing will be informative, the third portion, interim, and the last portion will be summative. They will get a final rating at the end of the year. This new testing is part of the Race-to-the-Top. 26 states that received the Race-to-the-Top funding are currently putting this testing in place. Mrs. Gailliard-Garrick will coordinate all of this testing within the school. There are four quarters in a school year. The students will be tested at the end of each. How long they are, Mrs.

Gailliard-Garrick has no idea but they will be aligned to the common core standards.

The Commissioner has hired a number of consultants across the country who are doing a lot of research in determining what model they are going to use for the evaluation system as well as the PARCC. There isn't a lot of information out on it as of yet. Over the summer, the Commissioner formed six working groups that work on this: Professional Practices for Teachers, Professional Practices for Administrators, Support Development and Initiatives, Progress Group on Implementation, Progress Group on Student Learning, and Professional Responsibilities. She also has an advisory committee for the Educator's Evaluation System.

Second Component: Professional Practices

Common expectations have been established for administrators and teachers. All of this can change, but currently, they are talking about going in six times a year to do observations of teachers. One observation will be formal and an hour long. They will meet with the teachers and talk about their classroom instruction, etc. Then there will be five short observations. Everything that they are going to be observing and measuring teacher performance will be based on a rubric.

Will this still have to be approved by the union or negotiated? "No." It is to Mrs. Gailliard-Garrick's understanding that this is going to be the instrument. There is also another one out there that the AFT, the American Federation of Teachers, has created. They want to field test theirs. They will then come together based on the findings to tweak or merge the two evaluation systems.

Relative to the professional practices, they are looking at eleven professional teaching standards, and from them, they decided to look at 27 competencies that they are going to be measuring. They divided them into four domains: Preparation and Planning, Classroom Instruction, Classroom Environment, Assessment, Reflection, and Improvement. That rubric is going to measure these four domains with the 27 competencies embedded somewhere within the four. This is what the evaluators will be looking at when they go in to do an observation of a teacher.

Again, there will be six observations a year, three in the fall and three in the spring. The five short observations will be unannounced. The one formal observation will be announced. At the end of the year, the teacher will get a final grading on their performance. It will all mean change in contract language. All the evaluation data will go to RIDE.

Third Component: Professional Responsibility

This is about teacher professional development, being committed to students, advocating for students, just being a part of the school community and environment. Will these evaluations be disseminated publically? Knowing the Commissioner, "yes, they publish everything else" but Mrs. Gailliard-Garrick doesn't know anything about it yet. People can already look up to see if a teacher is highly qualified or not.

RIDE is going to have a draft of this evaluation system done by Feb. 14th. Then they are going to do the field testing with Central Falls, Providence, Portsmouth, and Cranston. With those findings, they will tweak it. All of this will be done between now and September as well as the training. As of 2012, once this instrument is used, there are going to be consequences with those who have not been deemed “effective.” There has been a lot of discussion on this portion of the evaluation system with the unions so she doesn’t think there is going to be an easy transition from one system to the new system because they want to tie it into the renewal of certifications. So if you are deemed either “minimally ineffective” or “ineffective” for two years, your teacher recertification could be jeopardized and we, as the Board of Trustees and the administrators, can move toward dismissal. We have to be prepared for the possibility of grievances and arbitration hearings. This has been discussed and it is in the Race to the Top application.

The next step is they are asking us to establish a district evaluation committee that is to be comprised of core teachers, administrators, support personnel, and union representation. Their charge is going to be looking at and overseeing the evaluation system; looking at the effectiveness, the validity and utility of the system; and analyzing any data based on the evaluation. Then they will have to report this out to RIDE. This is part of the new longitudinal data system that RIDE is putting into place as well. They will be feeding in teacher’s names, teacher’s rosters, student’s test scores, etc, and tying that all into the rating system for the evaluation.

The challenge of implementing the Educator’s Evaluation System is the change of the contract language. Regarding the third year of the contract based on that MOU, we are looking at just meeting with them prior to July 15th. At that time, we can discuss any of the data that Cheryl Carroll has collected regarding finances. We are obligated to have this meeting and since the Commissioner is asking us to open up contract negotiations because of the contract language on the evaluation of teachers as it pertains to the announced/unannounced observations as well as how many times. The contract language needs to be changed so we can implement this new evaluation system as of 2011. The language states how many times an evaluator can go into a classroom and observe a teacher. We will meet with Mr. Ragosta to discuss what the language needs to look like, bring it to the Board, and then communicate it to the union, not necessarily negotiate it but do another memorandum of agreement for that final year of their contract. The timing is not good for us.

Dr. Segovis asked if help was needed to work with the Mr. Ragosta and the union on the language changes. The administration can start the legwork on a draft so that the board can get an idea of what we are looking at regarding what fits for Davies with the language and what fits into what the Commissioner is asking. They are going to give us more guidelines. Currently they are looking at contract languages across the state. They required each district to submit a copy of their contracts. They are also looking at the language so hopefully they will come back and give us

some guidance on it. There's a potential they will have some language to be used across the state.

If they made the changes at the state level, they not only would make it easier for everyone, but it's a message to say this is how it is going to be. Instead it is going to be 40 or so different designs of how it is going to be rolled out. It will leave all these attorneys employed in all of these districts as to how to enter discussions and labor negotiations on these. They are also leaving the piece about the dismissals of ineffective teachers up to the district level in determining how you are going to go about doing that. These two areas are major when implementing a new system. They should have more of a role in what it should look like.

From Dr. Segovis's perspective, what you do in a good Human Resource situation, you have clear documentation, clear warnings, and then clear opportunities to remediate and change the situation. With the negotiation committee, is to sit down and talk with Mr. Ragosta and then come back to the Board with his anticipation, not only budgetary but the grievances, how we make sure our paper trail is documented given all the remediation and arbitrations of these types of situations; how far do we have to go. Also there needs to be more money for teacher remediation (professional development plans). These are tenured teachers with say 16 years so they have a vested interest in their jobs. "Rather than suing one and another from a union perspective, will we get your support for remediation?"

In the systems Ms. Palmer has been in, it really didn't involve a lot of money because the administrators put in very, very guarded goals. What it really came down to was the earnestness of the teachers to correct it. If we see a willingness and earnestness on the part of the teacher and some steps taken toward remediation, then we can say we see growth so we will extend this another year for you. The union will be happy to see that. The two systems she was in, there was close dialogue with the union at all points. It's not a mechanism to get rid of an unpopular person but it's a mechanism by which you document somebody who really doesn't belong in the field of teaching and so, therefore, move onto something else.

Mrs. Gailliard-Garrick asked if we could get some examples of contract language from states that already have this system in place. Ms. Palmer will see if she can get it from Massachusetts, but she doesn't think there is specific language on the system, but there was general non-performance language.

b) Common Core State Standards [CCSS]

The CCSS is a change in what is being taught in the classroom, all the skills and skill sets. They will begin rolling out these new standards in March 2011. These standards are also a part of the Race to the Top application. The money that is being given to Davies from the Race to the Top is going to be used for the study of standards and other professional development initiatives regarding the change from the current standards, Grade Span Expectations [GSEs], to the Common Core Standards [CCSS]. It is a very cohesive framework for student expectations and for

teaching and learning. It is national; all 50 states signed on for these new standards K-12. Right now they are looking at English Language Arts and Mathematics.

If you compare the old GSEs with the new CCSS, you will see they changed them minimally. In ELA, it continues to be Reading, Writing, Speaking and Listening. They added another, Language Skills which is the vocabulary, grammar, etc. The students will be tested on these four strands in ELA. They are changing Mathematics a little bit. They are looking at more concepts and there are categories within those concepts. A lot of the changes with the CCSSs occurred in grades 5-8. The 9th-12th are pretty much the same. There will be little changes in our curriculums regarding the CCSS in Math. In Science, Social Studies and Technology, it is a little different and they still don't know where they are going with some of this. With the Science and the Social Studies, they will not be measuring the student's content knowledge but their ELA skills, and also math in Science.

In addition to looking at the CCSS for Science, they are also looking at an additional new test that will measure content knowledge, "The Next Generation." Mrs. Gailliard-Garrick hasn't seen it; she has been hearing about it, and there is nothing on line about it. She has the Science department chair looking into it. She doesn't think they are looking at an additional test for measuring Social Studies content knowledge. They will probably leave it up to the individual districts.

We are in very good shape. The transition from the GSEs to the CCSS is going to be an easy one once the teachers get on board. They are looking at 2013 to start introducing and rolling out the CCSSs. There is a lot going on. We have a Commissioner who is a reformist and she does a lot of national research to see how they improve student achievement and where the gaps are.

c) Partnership for the Assessment of Readiness for College Careers [PARCC]
Mrs. Gailliard-Garrick already talked about this component when she reported on the Educator's Evaluation System (see above agenda item.)

Dr. Segovis asked if we should have a Parent Night when we will focus just on these systems and have the Board there to answer questions. It is required every year that we do a presentation on the graduation requirements in October and in April relative to the whole Senior Project. Then we will send something out through our Guidance letters once they finalize the graduation requirements, hopefully soon. Dr. Segovis would like to coordinate everyone's schedule so the Board can attend the April session in order to make a bigger announcement than we normally do to talk about the changes. He thinks the Board's support is going to be needed.

6) Other

We need to pull together a February meeting date. It will require a quorum. S. Paquin will poll the board for a 5:30 p.m. start time, for the second week of the month. It can't be the first week because the Director will be away at a Conference. If Dr. Segovis cannot make the meeting, Mrs. Kyle will run the meeting.

IV. *15-Minutes of Strategic Thinking*

We invited our political people, only one showed up, but he was the right one. Dr. Segovis appreciated all the work Mr. Ouellette did on this.

As Rep. Petraca stated he is committed and he understands some of the politicalness between the school and the unions. We will be setting up a group to work on some strategies/a plan to get the legislators to advocate for us. So we are looking for volunteers to sit in on this group and begin working on a plan of action. The volunteers were Mr. Boisselle, Mr. Chartier, Mrs. Kyle, Mr. Ouellette, Dr. Segovis, and Mrs. Smith.

Mr. Blumenthal will send out some dates to see when everyone is all available. We are looking at maybe a couple of hours. We need to come up with a good set of facts so we need to start collecting some information and put it into a 2-page summary because that is what sells; go with one message and pound it home. We don't get much chance for anything else. We also said to put together some testimonies from some of our alum; even some of our current students. We just had two of our current students from our Biotechnology Program get accepted into URI's School of Pharmacy which is a major accomplishment because they only take 90 students a year.

Mrs. Gailliard-Garrick mentioned that she presented the Board's Strategic Plan proposal to the Department Coordinators. She got some good information from them. Their responses were more student-focused as opposed to the Board's that were more global. It will be a good combination of the two. At the next meeting, they are going to put together an action plan with the intension to incorporate the two. Mrs. Smith suggested that the Strategic Planning agenda item be moved to earlier in the meeting. It will be moved to the "Business Agenda" section, letter "A". We will recess into Executive Session after that.

V. *Adjournment*

At 9:30 a.m., Dr. Segovis asked for a motion to adjourn and all were in favor.