

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

Board of Trustees

Minutes of the Regular Meeting

April 07, 2011

Minutes were approved at the June 2, 2011 Board Meeting.

I. Routine

A. **Call Meeting to Order**

At 8:14 a.m., Dr. 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; Robert Boisselle; Raymond Chartier; Carolyn Hebert; Paul Ouellette; James Segovis, *Chairperson*; Robin Smith

Members Absent: Lawrence Gemma; Robert Halkyard; Carolyn Kyle, *Vice-Chairperson*; John Quinn

Others Present: Victoria A. Gailliard-Garrick; Joanne Andrews; Cheryl Carroll; B. Blumenthal; Susan Paquin, William Foley

C. **Approval of Minutes**

Dr. Segovis asked for a motion to accept the February 10 and March 3, 2011 minutes. Mrs. Smith made a motion to accept the minutes; Mr. Boisselle 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**

A motion to recess into Executive Session was deferred until the end of the agenda.

E. **Return to Regular Session**

Did not recess out of Regular Session at this point on the agenda.

F. **Opportunity for Audience to Comment**

No comments from the audience.

II. Business Agenda

A. **Strategic Planning**

No report given.

B. **Finance Report** – Cheryl Carroll, Business Office Coordinator

The following report is an update on the new funding formula which will begin fiscal year 2012. We will be monitoring the enrollment very closely. We will

need to keep all seats filled because enrollment equates to dollars for Davies' budget. Ms. Carroll and Mrs. Gailliard-Garrick attended a meeting at RIDE on the longevity issue and the funding formula. This meeting was a real eye-opener. We thought the state funded portion of the funding formula would be adjusted as the enrollment changes, but that is incorrect. The state piece remains frozen based on the initial enrollment count. There will be no more money from the state unless a significant change takes place, e.g., 800-1000. We will still be able to bill the districts for their piece.

RIDE requested our enrollment for next year by March 1st, but because our admissions process is different than other schools because of our testing component, RIDE waived that deadline for us this year only until April after our application submission deadline which is the 15th. We will be excepting 270 9th graders and 28 10th graders and hopefully they will make an adjustment to the state aid.

Mr. Beaupre asked if there is going to be some resistance from the sending districts. RIDE is putting together some kind of regulations regarding the local share and how that money has to be transmitted to the school, career and tech centers, and charters schools. This whole billing process to the districts is all new to us so Ms. Carroll has requested a meeting calling all the business managers from each of the districts together here at Davies. She has asked Carolyn Dias to join them to make sure everyone is all on the same page. Ms. Dias is publishing a document on local share guidance and she will provide copies of it at the meeting.

Mr. Beaupre asked if we knew how much the local shares are going to be. It is a different answer for each district. The richest district could be anywhere from \$4000-\$6000 per student. The poorer district could be as low as \$1000 per student. Obviously it would be in our best interest to get more students from the more economically rich communities.

Dr. Segovis added the state's contribution of the budget is frozen and for this year, it is most of the budget but as time goes on that share decreases. Yes, we will be eased into the impact of the new funding formula over the next five-ten years, which eventually means a \$7 million cut.

- C. **Human Resources Report** – *Joanne Andrews, H.R. Coordinator*
Report was given in Executive Session.

III. Informational Time/Program Updates

A. Director's Report

1) Davies Teachers' Association — *William Foley, President*

The Senate has started a commission looking into the funding of career and technical education in RI. NEARI had a seat at the table and they asked him to take that seat and he accepted. His biggest concern after getting updated by Ms. Carroll, is the local share. There is a bean counter sitting somewhere saying, e.g., we can hold back 50 students in Pawtucket because the money follows the student now, not have to hire another teacher, so there is no added cost to Pawtucket to keep those 50 kids in Pawtucket as opposed to sending them here. They will keep \$8200 times 50 kids.

The good news is Senator Gallo is the chair of the commission and she is a support of Davies and career and technical education as well as others on the committee, but there are also some who have their own agenda. The overall feel he has is they all know there is a problem and to continue functioning under the current formula guidelines is ridiculous. We are working together in trying to open eyes to what this problem is. Senator Gallo had an alternate funding formula last year that held career and tech harmless. Chariho is looking into changing the funding formula, but it will be for the centers and not Davies.

Another big supporter of career and technical education is Rep. Denise Aikens out of Warwick/West Warwick.

Dr. Segovis asked him if he will be sending a formal letter to the administration requesting to review the contract. Mr. Egan will be generating that letter.

2) **Davies Teacher Assistants' Association**

No representation present.

3) **NECAP: Performance Classification** – *V. Gailliard-Garrick, Director*

The performance classification came out last week and we met all of our targets. There are 17 targets that they look at to determine a performance classification. One is participation, another is graduation, and then there are subcategories like IEP, socio-economic status, race, and then they determine performance based on those categories for Math and ELA. We met all of our categories; therefore, we are classified as meeting our AYP (Average Yearly Progress) which is determined by the federal government.

Our classification, however, they added a new one this year. Last year, if you recall, we did not meet the graduation requirement. This year we went up 18 points, but due to not meeting that target last year, they have a new category called “Delayed.” They are looking for two consecutive years to change our classification. Last year we were “Caution” because of the graduation rate. So we currently have “Delayed” and next year when we meet all the targets again, our classification will change to meeting that AYP. We are in good standing.

We are now in the preparation of looking at changing our curriculum. There is going to be a new state test, PARCC Assessment. We are looking at a whole new design, “Schooling by Design.” Mrs. V. Gailliard-Garrick attended a conference a few weeks ago looking at schooling by design, a curriculum-based design, and some other new initiatives that she will share with the board probably in June. This ties into the Commissioner Gist’s initiatives and the new teacher evaluation system.

Every year Mrs. Gailliard-Garrick has a staff meeting to report on the performance classification and then she provides them with a luncheon by Aramark during Teacher Appreciation Week to show her appreciation for the work they do and more so their cooperation and collaboration in moving forward especially with all these changes being thrown at us one after another.

4) **Regents' Graduation Requirements**— *V. Gailliard-Garrick, Director*
(*See supplemental material: "2008 and 2011 Graduation Requirement Regulations"*)

The handout is a nice overview of the changes made to the 2008 regulations and what is going to be in place by 2014. RIDE had some open forums and people were extremely upset about the three-tiered diploma system, so they decided not to go in that direction. It is still a three-tiered system just packaged differently.

The major difference between the 2008 regs and the 2011 regs is at one time the state assessment (NECAP) was part of the graduation requirements but it wasn't a major portion of it. The other two components, credits and the two multiple measures could assist in determining whether a child was proficient in ELA and Mathematics. This is no longer the case. As of the Class of 2014, a student has to pass the NECAP with at least a "2" which is "partially proficient." This has now been incorporated into the graduation requirements. Also, if a student does not get a "2", they are looking at a scale score of the actual NECAP test. If a student gets a "1," "substantially below proficient" they will be required to retake the test. Now they are looking at a change of a point scale to determine if there is any growth. Rumor has it is going to be a 5-point difference from the score they initially received. If they show growth then they will be able to graduate.

They've taken away the diploma tiers and will be doing what Davies has been doing over the last four years. Those students who are proficient, Davies has been giving them an endorsed diploma, but RIDE is calling it a "commended" diploma. They will get a seal on their diploma to show recognition that they made proficiency. All others will get a regular RI diploma.

If these requirements were being implemented this year, than we would have 38 seniors not graduating. Only two seniors showed growth in the retake of the NECAP this year. We have a lot of work to do. We put into the Title 1 grant, Literacy and Numeracy, to have a summer program to do some ramp-up to proficiency. Mrs. Gailliard-Garrick feels that these seniors and the seniors to come before 2014 know the NECAP doesn't impact whether or not they graduate so they retake the test and do not take it seriously. Then there are a number of those 38 students who have an IEP, about 15.

Dr. Segovis recalls Mrs. Gailliard-Garrick mentioning that there are advantages to offering a three-tiered diploma. For our school district, can we implement a three-tiered system as a way of distinguishing outstanding students. Mrs. Gailliard-Garrick thought it would set some achievement goals for some students. At the next Board meeting, Dr. Segovis would like to discuss this proposal. It sends a positive message that we hold our students to a higher standard. Bryant University's economists have reported on where the jobs are really going and if you do not have math skills that are above basic, then you are not going to survive.

Mrs. Smith asked about those students on IEPs. Some of those students really cannot get to a certain level and they might excel in one of the shop areas. Is there any way of developing an alternative diploma for those students who

frankly struggle with reading, writing, and computation at a high school level? How do we give them some satisfactory level of completion? Right now they get two diplomas. They get a competency diploma in the technical area. It identifies various areas of competency in their technical training, but Mrs. Gailliard-Garrick likes Mrs. Smith's idea that it should be something in addition to just the competency checklist. They should get something for an outstanding technical student. They do get a certificate from industry. Mrs. Smith asked with the new diploma system, will they be able to graduate? Yes, if they meet that 5-point growth indicator. We can do a transition plan for them. We can keep them for an additional year and provide them with other support services to help them to gain those 5 points needed for the diploma. Right now those students cannot walk across the stage; they are excluded from the graduation ceremony because they are not getting a diploma awarded to them, so the question is, okay they have done their best; the IEP says that they are not going to do x, y, and z; you give them a 5th year and they are still doing the same, what are you going to do with those kids after the 5th year?

5) Organization & Employee Development Proposal – J. Andrews, Human Resources Coordinator

(See supplemental material: “Davies Non-Faculty Organizational and Employee Development”)

This is proposal that was presented to Dr. Segovis's predecessor, Mr. Ferdinandi, just before he resigned from the board. He gave us an approval, but it needs to go through the approval process again now that Dr. Segovis is chair of the board. Basically what we are trying to do is even out the playing field with the teachers and the teacher assistants when it comes to professional development opportunities.

The program is to recognize non-union/non-faculty personnel who are the administrators and non-faculty support people. In essence, it is to make sure they are also doing what needs to get done as they continue within their practice which is upgrade your skills. This policy mirrors the PDA for the teachers and it aligns to what we need to do for the Race-to-the-Top. V. Gailliard-Garrick added that it is an incentive to those staff members to continue their own professional development and also with the number of furlough days, the number of percentage decreases in our salaries, this can help recoup some of that lost money and it also serves the purpose of being able to increase their skills and content knowledge in their area, etc. It is the same stipend as the teachers. It is 35 hours a year that is preapproved; then they have to come back and do a PD session with the staff. The stipend this year is \$750.00.

Dr. Segovis asked for a motion to approve this policy; Mrs. Smith made the motion to approve the Davies Non-Faculty Organizational and Employee Development Plan; Mr. Boisselle seconded the motion and all were in favor.

6) 9th/10th Admissions 2011-2012 – V. Gailliard-Garrick, Director

This report was given as a part of the Finance Report earlier on the agenda.

7) Other

- a) Two Providence Journal articles:
 - “Davies’ auto program gets students set for the future”
 - “Jobless in RI urged to “retool, reorganize””

Davies is mentioned in the article. Economist Paul E. Harrington spoke at a summit hosted by the state Senate. He held up Davies as a model for how training institutions must work in a world where long-term relationships between educators and employers are more important than any individual referral.

- b) There was a meeting with the Teacher Excellence Award Committee and they came up with a 4-step process: nomination of teachers, team review, personal reflection, and a final selection. They came up with seven criteria: professional development activities, evaluation (looking at organization, classroom management, student engagement, support to students and programs, their involvement and support, attendance, instructional time, contract obligations (CPT, professional conferences, open house, etc.), community involvement (communication with agencies/businesses/industry/parents) promoting professional learning communities.

The committee’s next step in this process is they are going to define and give each criterion a written definition which is going to be research-based. The committee will also develop rubrics (rating skills based on these categories) and then create the nomination form, the review process and what we will be looking for in the personal reflection along with a rating scale for it.

The next meeting will be after the April vacation so we working ahead on this.

- c) Dr. Segovis thanked those board members who already contributed to the Yearbook ad, and for those who haven’t yet, he will accept anything they have to offer. He thanked Mr. Blumenthal for coordinating it.
- d) Partnerships in Education Breakfast will be held on May 4th, from 8:30 am – 9:30 am. Trustees are asked to give a call to Pat Perillo in the School-to-Career Office to let her know if you will be coming or not. Another option is they can return the invitation through the mail.
- e) Next Board meeting was scheduled for May 12, 2011, at 8:00 a.m.

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 9:00 a.m., Dr. Segovis asked for a motion to recess into Executive Session. Mr. Boisselle 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; Mrs. Smith seconded the motion; and all were in favor.

Return to Regular Session

At 9:18 a.m., Dr. Segovis asked for a motion to recess out of Execution Session. Mr. Beaupre made the motion to recess back into Regular Session; Mr. Boisselle seconded the motion; and all were in favor.

Dr. Segovis asked for a motion to seal the minutes of the Executive Session; Mr. Boisselle made the motion to seal the minutes of the Executive Session; Mr. Chartier seconded the motion; and all were in favor.

A vote was not taken during Executive Session. Strictly personnel information was discussed.

V. Adjournment

At 9:21 a.m., Dr. Segovis asked for a motion to adjourn and all were in favor.