

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 7, 2011

(Minutes were approved at the Dec. 12, 2011 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; Raymond Chartier; Robert Halkyard; Carolyn Hebert;
James Segovis, Ph.d., *Chairperson*

Members Absent: Robert Boisselle; Lawrence Gemma; Carolyn Kyle, *vice-Chairperson*;
Paul Ouellette; John Quinn, Robin Smith

Others Present: Victoria A. Gailliard-Garrick; Joanne Andrews; Cheryl Carroll;
Bernie Blumenthal; Susan Paquin; William Foley;
Carolyn Dias, *RIDE*, Vanessa Cooley, *RIDE*

C. **Approval of Minutes**

Approval of the September 9 and October 3, 2011 meeting minutes were deferred until the December meeting because a quorum was not present.

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. **Return to Regular Session**

N/A

F. **Opportunity for Audience to Comment**

No comments from the audience. A parent was on the agenda to address the board on a school policy concern but she did not appear.

II. Business Agenda

A. **Finance Report** – *Cheryl Carroll, Business Office Coordinator*
No report given.

B. **Human Resources Report** – *Joanne Andrews, H.R. Coordinator*
No report given.

C. **Nominating Committee Report**

Approval of Mr. Bone's re-nomination to the Board was deferred until the next meeting due to no quorum present. There is currently 11 trustees. Next month there will be two nominees on the agenda for voter approval, Mr. Bone and Mr. Brown, and then there will be one more on the way.

D. **December 5, 2011 Board Meeting**

E. **Strategic Plan and School Improvement Plan**

III. Informational Time/Program Updates

A. **Director's Report**

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

2) **Davies Teacher Assistants' Association**
No representation present.

3) **Questions Regarding the Funding Formula and the CTE Regulations—**
Carolyn Dias, COO of Fiscal Integrity and Efficiencies, RIDE
(See Supplemental Material: "Funding Formula; Points in Support of Changes to the Formula")

There have been a lot of questions about how will the CTE Regulations dovetail with the new funding formula.

Cheryl Carroll presented to Ms. Dias our concerns regarding the funding formula and the impact it is going to have and is having on Davies in regards to CTE training, etc. Mr. Beaupre asked if this funding formula started this year and if we have gotten paid. The answer was "Yes" to both questions.

We had brought our issues to the Special Senate Commission to Study the Funding of Vocational Schools that Mr. Foley, Davies Teachers' Association President sits on. There are still, in our world, inequities within the funding formula. In the past, the other CTE centers had probably a legitimate gripe that the districts got to send kids to Davies that was free to them. They paid no tuition. Those people who were sending kids to Warwick, Newport, or Woonsocket, there was a cost for each kid. There is now a fee, a local share of funds effective this year, that needs to go to Davies from our sending districts.

What is most upsetting is it seems as though there has been a complete turning of the tables. When we started going through the draft of the CTE Regs we got to the piece of transportation. We knew from the funding formula that we are responsible for transportation now. The districts will start to bill us to bus their kids to Davies to and from school every day. Legislation did that change. Davies would not exist if we were not CTE. If we were a comprehensive high school our kids would be staying in their districts. We started to see there was a regional transportation clause to the Regs. They have circles drawn in various regions of the state and it said if your district lies within that circle, you are responsible to bus your children to your region CTE Center. Why wouldn't that apply to Davies? It is because the legislators looked at us because we are a district within ourselves and we do academic instruction. The Dept of Educ.'s view is Davies is to be treated as a charter. Remembering what our first and foremost mission is there is a fact that any other person choosing technical education, that center is not getting charged for their children to be transported to and from that school as long as they fall within that circle drawn around the state. This is an added cost that Davies has that is not an added cost to operate Warwick, Woonsocket, etc and it is significant. It's pushing against us at time where we are in a ten-

year phase-out of very sizable funding, ie, the funding formula and the reductions it is yielding to us. This definitely upset us. It is a reversal of fortune, reversal of tables.

Ms. Dias clarified students going to the tech center in their town, the schools are paying for the students transportation; however, if a student wants to go to a career and tech center outside of their region, than the parent pays for that. V. Gailliard-Garrick said that is not our concern. We realize that. The schools within the region are paying for the transportation and they are an LEA. Davies is an LEA and you are just paying for your own students as well. Ms. Dias is confused about where we see the difference.

Mrs. Gailliard-Garrick said the difference is you have for example, our neighbors to the north, Woonsocket who have students coming from North Smithfield and Cumberland. North Smithfield and Cumberland are paying the transportation costs for those students to go to Woonsocket CTE Center. They are the sending catchment area for Woonsocket. They are paying. The tables have turned. Davies is an LEA. We have students that are coming from Pawtucket, North Providence, Central Falls. We, Davies, not the district, are now incurring that cost to transport those students from Pawtucket, Central Fall, and North Providence. We are paying their transportation costs, not vice versa. We are an LEA but they are not our students; they do not belong to us. They are still a part of the Pawtucket School System, for example.

Ms. Dias commented Davies is a stand-alone school, then Davies needs to be treated as a stand-alone school. She knows that we feel that might be inequitable. Mrs. Gailliard-Garrick wanted this presentation to go as smooth as possible. She asked Mrs. Dias to look at a couple of issues/concerns regarding the funding formula, and yes, the transportation cost is one of them. There are four bulleted areas on the handout one of which is the transportation cost. Ms. Carroll did an estimate per the sending school district we provide services for. She did look at what the local share would be and the state share over the course of ten years. To Mrs. Gailliard-Garrick's understanding, based on the additional funds (the local share) of over and beyond the \$8333.00, that is the one that is supposedly going to incur the cost of the transportation and then the other costs associated with running Davies. Our concern is that local share from Pawtucket and Central Falls where the majority of our students come from, we are looking at a difference of \$1300, we are looking at based on the number of students from Pawtucket that we have to incur the transportation cost; we have to incur the cost of building repairs, we have to incur the cost of utilities, etc, and it is not realistic that we are going to be able to do that based on the funding that we are going to get. Over the 5 years, 10 years out, it isn't realistic.

This is just one of the bullets we have a concern. The transportation, we understand that Davies is an LEA and all the LEA's are responsible now for the transportation cost for those kids to go to the regional school, but if you look at a Woonsocket or if you look at a Warwick, they have part-time students coming in from one of their catchment area schools. That catchment area school is paying for the cost of the transportation, but they are a student of Warwick. They are a student of Warwick, part-time basis, but Warwick is not paying a fraction of that cost; that sending catchment area school is paying full cost of the transportation. That is where the discrepancy and a concern is that we have regarding the transportation cost that Davies is incurring.

Ms. Dias said if you want to be a stand-alone school then you need to be treated as a stand-alone school. If you want to be a regional center, then you need to be part of another community. They are just two very different animals. Right now we are our own separate LEA (Local Education Agency) and because we have that distinction, you are treated like a charter school and because of that you fall under the statutory guidelines that were laid out in the funding formula statute. If you want to compare yourselves to the regional centers, they are sending their kids out because again the money is following the students and so on. The students that come to Davies, they are your students. They are not Pawtucket's students; they are Davies students because you are your own LEA. Now is there a concern that Pawtucket isn't

sending enough money on with their student, absolutely. They are making do with that so we have to figure ways we can support those kids and become as efficient as possible. Davies has opportunities like the charter schools for fundraising and things like that. Mrs. Gailliard-Garrick asked her if Ms. Dias was telling her that we have to fundraise in order to educate our students. These are other things that happen outside of the instructional piece of the funding formula. Ms. Dias answered that the instructional piece should be funded through the formula, but the charter schools raise funds for facilities and other things like that. It isn't perfect, she gets it, but that is where we are at right now. Can it be changed, "maybe?"

Another bullet item on the handout, CTE centers get additional funding (tuition) on top of the \$8333.00 to run their technical centers. This is only because they are not getting the local share. When the formula is done, Davies is getting paid for all of our students. There is reason why the other centers have to get the additional funding through tuition billing because the community that owns that student is getting it through the formula. They are taking their funding formula distribution, whatever local shares that they have, —ok, N. Smithfield wants to send to Woonsocket 50% of the time to take courses. North Smithfield needs to come up with a methodology that is fair and equitable to send their student to Woonsocket because Woonsocket needs the money. The difference is that Davies and the Met School and the charter schools are getting the money for those students so there is no tuition coming in. You are already getting it and quite honestly there are a lot of benefits for being your own LEA.

She has to figure out a way of determining the criteria for funding the career and technical fund. This is additional revenue for CTE. She is struggling with this and asked the board for some input. She will be putting a committee together. RIDE has gone out and did an analysis of how much does it cost to run a program? Let's compare it to other high school programs. She can't come up with anything because the evidence isn't there. Mrs. Gailliard-Garrick and Ms. Carroll keep saying to them, "No you need to look at it this way." This question is still out there and there is still opportunity out there for innovation and high-cost programs. This is another opportunity for additional funding for us.

Those communities that have career and technical programs will be transitioning over ten years. RIDE decided to take a look at what the current costs are for these programs and come up with course benchmarks. They will be looking at the data over the next couple of weeks. She wants Mrs. Gailliard-Garrick and Ms. Carroll to make sure it is fair and equitable because it will ultimately impact the categorical fund. What is going to happen over time is those courses, if they have a very high per pupil now, we are going to come up with a benchmark. This doesn't necessarily mean they are going to get reimbursed full for what their current costs are. Right now the funding formula is saying that in some communities they have too much state funding. When you look at the benchmark, what do you think the Woonsocket program is going to have for a benchmark? That community has not put significant investments in that system in years and years for whatever reason so they have a low per pupil amount. They received huge amounts of state funding and did not put any of their own in.

We have to take into consideration a lot of the things about how to adequately fund programs. Keep in mind, the benchmark will be updated as we get more equitable funding across the state as we transition this formula to 100%. Those are the kinds of things that are happening now as far as the tuition goes. Until we get the benchmarks in place, in year one right now they are billing under the current methodology which is a mess. The regulations are going to fix that. We have career and tech centers across the state; they are just coming up with their own way of billing. We have put out there two years ago recommendations about how the methodology should look. Some CTE are using the one in the old regs and it doesn't even makes since. We have to fix that, but when we fix it we are going to make sure every program is funded in an adequate and equitable way. This is where RIDE's thinking is with a lot of input from experts from the field and from here. If we find ways through this process, we can always go back and tweak the formula, but she has to say, she looked at the data when she did the course benchmarking (Chariho, Newport, Davies, Exeter-West Greenwich, Cranston) they kept looking at it in

different ways, she couldn't find why the cost was that much higher than running a regular science program. Overall, she couldn't find it.

Dr. Segovis said there is national data that career and technical eds get per head at a range of \$13,000 up to \$20,000 per pupil. Then you go in and look at what are the programs being offered, we were closer to high. When you look within RI then you are looking programs that have been run on less for years where Davies, he thought, was supposed to be one of the benchmark schools in the state and how we are running with the rest of the RI centers. If you look at other national benchmark schools, they are running closer to the \$18,000 where we are, plus. That was a reality. When you make a benchmark school, you try to lower the quality, then that shows what types of programs you run, you are not going to get the same punch for the dollar. It can't be all things to all people and if you do that then we are heading down the road Ms. Dias is describing, a scramble for the dollars.

The Finance Committee was supposed to be looking at the Massachusetts system for funding the CTE's. When they passed the funding formula they left out CTE and that is why we are in this mad scramble now. They were supposed to look at Mass because they fund CTE differently. He asked where has that gone in the meantime? Ms. Dias hasn't even heard of it. They are probably referring to the categorical funding. Ms. Dias would like a copy of that national data.

The Commission on Career and Technical Education Funding, the same type of study was done by the Met School. Ms. Dias continued, if the data shows it, RIDE will do it. This gets into the weight conversation about Special Ed, ELL. We looked at the weight and what they found was in every single state, in every single study, they had no data on how they came up with the weights. RIDE said let's take it one step further. Let's go out and do our own study. We will form our criteria for the career and tech fund. What are they spending in that classroom? We took into account teacher/student ratios. We can look at it again. If they have empirical data on how they established the weights, absolutely she wants to see it. But this is the piece that has been missing all along. If the studies are just showing what other states are doing about the weights, they didn't come up with any validation, no core studies behind it.

Dr. Segovis asked if she was saying the programs are being run either inefficiently or they are hiding dollars. Ms. Dias answered if you have benchmark schools that have empirical data behind it, then we can use that information to figure out how do we move forward to make sure these programs are adequately funded. All she is saying is that she went down to the career and tech centers; she talked to the superintendents and asked them what is she missing here. They said nothing. When we do the benchmarking, we need to look at what is the cost of similar programs of study in Ct, MA, and maybe NH. That is the data we looked at for the core instruction. She agrees with Dr. Segovis. She doesn't believe we should just look at Woonsocket data. We have to have good data to make sure we understand the cost of these programs. We just want to get it right because if we need to fix that categorical fund in a way to get additional funding here, that we will but she can't do it without the data.

How much more does it cost to run a technical program? We know from what we have nationally. You have programs that are probably equal to a course in general ed. That isn't what we have here. We are in additional to general ed. Ms. Dias isn't getting that. It will be helpful if she is shown this. Mr. Chartier said a Pawtucket student in one of their high schools takes English, History, Science and Math. Then they usually have two study periods so you can put any teacher, any teacher to take care of them. Basically it is babysitting. Here, they go to Auto Tech, or they go to Construction Tech and what happens is they have to have professional people teaching these courses. We have to have in Auto Tech mechanics, body shop, all those courses that go into that (you get money for that), you have to have teachers in there who are experts in their fields, they are not babysitters. We are also trying to put these kids into the state's workforce. What happens is whether it is in Auto, Business Tech, any tech program

here, this is in addition to the regular education. It is not the same. Ms. Dias asked if they are going to school more than the regular students are. It is totally different than going to a regular high school. You have the academics and then you have the career and tech. It is like two stand-alone schools. What happens is the children come here and learn the academics and they also have their career and tech over here. So what happens is it costs more to fund this school. It is common sense that it costs more. He has sat on this board; he has had to children graduate here; he currently has a student that comes here; each one of them went through it. Ms. Dias suggested going back to look at the day and the life of a student here at Davies. She doesn't know what to do anymore.

Mrs. Gailliard-Garrick can talk about the scheduling another time, but briefly she said when you look at 7 period day, we have two houses for the 7 periods with a full complement of teachers, academic and technical. We can have this conversation at a later date and maybe give Ms. Dias a better, clearer understanding of what is being presented here because the course is different on a full complement of the 7 period day for a tech teacher vs. an academic teacher. This is what she thinks Ms. Dias might be missing. What they can do is come up with a profile and then we can profile by the high school, regular general ed vs. Davies type of high school. Here you can't get certifications unless you do math, so we have to do due diligence on that. We can't just let the students walk through.

Mr. Foley asked Ms. Dias if the categorical funding is supposed to take care of additional cost of career and technical education. "Yes." His problem is that money is not there; it has been taken out of the budget so Year One, Davies which is the only stand-alone career and tech (along with the Met) is one year behind the eight ball already. Unless there is some change to the funding formula we are going to be behind the eight ball again next year because we are going to plan on, hope for the categorical funding again and it isn't going to be there. The position he is taking on the Commission is that it needs to be added into the funding formula like the students success factor. There should be a career and tech factor already built into the formula funding, not a stand-alone piece that someone can take off the budget because we need to cut 10 million dollars.

He does have a concern about the transportation cost. To clarify, what you said, that a student resides in a district and is therefore that districts responsibility to transport that student. The categorical fund, based on its definition, was supposed to take care of the transportation. "No" but there was a transportation categorical funding that was supposed to be available for a district to cover off-set costs to send a kid out of region is Ms. Carroll's understanding.

Ms. Dias would love to be able to say one percent of the entire formula, transportation would automatically get funded. She totally agrees with Mr. Foley. They have to commit to these funds. Out of all the categorical funds, the two she believes will get funded will be CTE and high-need special ed. With Chairman Mello, you can see the support for CTE. It is in the legislature. We have to watch it. Mr. Foley's other concern with the transportation cost is you are comparing us with the Met and the charter schools in that line of statutory legislation. Charter schools such as Blackstone Valley, 90% of the students that go there are coming from the catchment area so most of them walk. The majority of our students have to take a bus that we have to provide. So you compare us to the met and the charters, the percentage of students that they actually have to bus, is miniscule. Ms. Dias said we can get the lowest possible cost to bus your students with the statewide program.

The point is Mrs. Gailliard-Garrick said if you look at the MET campus, 75% of the students that go there live in the city of Providence. The cost is miniscule compared to what Davies has to pay. That is the point Mr. Foley was trying to make. Mr. Foley would like to see RIDE's empirical data that they used to determine what the MET, Davies and the charters are now going to pick up for the transportation costs. What was the dollar amount you estimated that would cost Davies? He has a hard time believing that they came up half a million to a million dollars. Is that still the projection? Cindy Brown at RIDE

took a look at what would be the least expensive way to bus a kid here. She took a look at bus sharing, it's a half million on the least expensive side. Mr. Foley said if we are to look at benchmarks or any other data we provide about what it costs for CTE, you need empirical data. Then you came up with a funding formula and now all of a sudden Davies is paying for transportation, there should have been empirical data that said that is going to be this much. If ours is going to be substantially more than any other charter or met school, if you are looking at an average, but ours is 20% higher than the average, then something has to be done to take care of the difference. If you are going to use empirical data, then you need to use it here also because if you are not, then what you are coming up is false.

Mrs. Dias would like to have any information we can provide her. There is a transportation categorical fund but it is for the regional school districts. We looked at this empirical data and it showed because of the distance we were able to say, okay, we will give you some relief on that because it is costing you more than the other traditional LEA. This is something that we can look at for Davies and tweak the legislation but she said that based on the ½ million dollars a year, that money might get us there. If she goes back and looks at the charter schools, we are going to know for the first time this year, how much it is costing those charter schools to bus. We are going to get it down to a per pupil. We can work on it for the 2013 year, but we need to work together getting the information. We are totally wide open in trying to figure out how to fund our categorical fund. She would really like to do the profile. We need to look at the scheduling of a student. That is the key.

Ms. Dias realized there is a lot of frustration. Although it didn't happen this year, the categorical fund will relieve the cost of those high-cost programs based on the data, but Mrs. Gailliard-Garrick's concern is it will be competitive and restrictive on how we can spend that categorical funding when it comes to fruition. "Maybe not." This categorical fund is wide open and she needs help in figuring it out but she made it clear that she also wants to ensure that it complements the legislation that talks about innovation and bringing in supports from the industries. Maybe we have to make it a bigger fund. We just need to get it to be what it needs to be and then we can add to it and when we go to the legislature, she has the data to show why it needs to happen and why it needs to change.

Mr. Halkyard made one point on what Ms. Dias kept talking about; do we want to be an LEA? We are very different from other LEA's. In a perfect world, this LEA would sit down and have the best knowledge of what the costs are to run this school effectively for our kids. Then we would send a bill to somebody just like other LEA's do. We don't have that ability to send the bill to you. In the perfect world, that is what it should come down to. If we are good at doing what we do and know what we are doing, we should decide what it costs to run this school and then send you the bill and you send us the money, but unfortunately it is running the other way around. You are controlling the money and tell us how much you are going to give us, and then we have to try to figure how to provide a good education with it. That is the basic flaw in this how thing as far as he is concerned.

In turn, Ms. Dias said that the other regional centers are not going to be able to bill for what they think. They are not; they are going to bill what the benchmark tells us what it costs to run a program. Even though you have a cost of \$18, 000-\$19,000 to run, that might not necessarily mean that is what you are going to bill. Let's take a look at the benchmark, the data, because in her mind, we are better off being an LEA just to clarify how we are approaching this.

Ms. Carroll said that looking at the day-in –the-life of a Davies student is going to be a huge help because we know we are sure of what we are saying and it isn't being relayed so a day-in-the-life will be good. In doing so, one of the things that is going to pop out will be the teacher cost to do the instructional delivery in a CTE program. When you look at a Warwick, a Woonsocket, isn't the cost of the teacher needed at the centers, not even in the CTE budget? Aren't the CTE centers' FTE's in the municipal budget? We need to look at that data.

Dr. Segovis added that when we get a student from Central Falls, we have to do remedial work to get them up to grade level. Central Falls got money for years to try to remediate and they haven't. We get them and we actually get results in the end. That should count for something. Do we destroy that and end up being mediocre like everyone else which seems to be contrary to where the Commissioner and the Regents want to go. So if we are already there, why nickel and dime. Let's maintain where we need to go and start arguing to the public these are the things we have to do to become good at what you do versus twisting it apart. We are a school of excellence. We have been nationally recognized and we are getting results. If we are wasting money, if you are showing that this isn't appropriate, then that is different. I am for accountability. We are an example that we hold ourselves accountable as a board and the results we are getting in this school take this much money; we have the data ourselves; then that is the money it takes. If some other school is doing the exactly the same thing for less, then he would love to learn what they are doing in quality management, and the board would be glad to implement that coming in but right now the battle is do you want to have that kid coming out the way we have or even better because our goal is to constantly improve. If it costs that, than we have to start arguing that is what it costs.

Ms. Dias said the cost per pupil nationally is less. We could have used that data, but what we did with the formula is we said every child deserves to get a basic education. We got that. Then we put in a categorical funding in. Let's figure out what it is so that we can then back up and support, where we can document that it is costing more money. She tried it but couldn't get her hook into it. She is truly trying but she feels she is missing something because she does believe that there may be some additional things that have to be done to serve these students. She is open to this. She thinks going back and taking a look at the scheduling is a good idea and then come up with a model. She agrees with Dr. Segovis. We need to ensure we put the best programs out there.

There are people committed to funding education. She knows they are committed to funding career and technical education. It was heard from the chairman. There is a commission that is studying it. They also want to be sure that we have the appropriate funding behind these kids. She is open to it. We just need to get back together and do a little bit more work and figure out what it is we need to come up with. She is walking away from this meeting with a couple of things. One is she is hearing that you are volunteering to help us revisit. She does want us to go back and look at the work that has been done to date by Brown University. Let's get together and come up with some really innovative ways to look at it through maybe a schedule. The second is she is also going to go back and look at transportation. Let's compare other schools of about 919 students and same geographical areas and see what the costs are.

Dr. Segovis thanked Ms. Dias for coming and for her openness. She was very informative. He appreciated her openness to other data, looking at it through a different lens.

3) **Career and Technical Education Regulations** — *Vanessa Cooley, Administer of Career and Technical Education, RIDE (Supplemental Material: Regulations of the Board of Regents Governing Career and Technical Education)*

The CTE regulations have not been updated since 1990 which is a long, long time ago, a total different era of career and technical education. At that point CTE was primarily heavy shop areas like Automotive, Construction and so on. Since that time CTE has expanded into 16 career cluster areas. It has really grown since that time. The original regulations were based on how to manage and govern career and technical education as it unfolded in centers. At that point, we had 8 centers when the 1990 regs were drafted. Since that time, 2 were added on; Davies was one and the Met was the other.

Basically, we want to make sure career and tech is not what some people have thought career and tech was; about those kids who couldn't cut it in a regular high school system. We want to make sure that it is everything needed in order to graduate and go on to post secondary education if they choose, go onto careers, and to earn family sustaining wages. The other portion of that is we want to make sure career and technical education give students more than a high school diploma. We want to make sure that they walk out of the door with credentials that show they know and can do particular things. We have moved for industry certifications where ever those are available.

There was a Regents' public hearing here at the school last Tuesday. There were concerns discussed not only with Davies but with the other technical centers as well. A lot of it rested on the accountability piece. Mr. Manning said a good amount of the time was spent on the funding formula, transportation costs we had to incur especially in light of the fact that he heard a lot conversation about getting our input and making sure Davies input was taken into account. His understanding is we heard about taking on the transportation cost in July and that was something we had to react to and not something we were able to be proactive about having the heads up on something and be able to put a plan together. We had to react to the fact that we were getting a ½ million dollar cut.

In terms of the accountability, one of the concerns that were brought up was that although the accountability piece is in place, it was put on hold this past hold. When you think about expanding innovative programs and more programs in the comprehensive high schools, how are we going to be able to make sure all of those programs are accountable and they are being assessed the same. There was a lot of talk about sequence of courses in the past. There were three sequences of courses to make a program of study. Now that has changed to two. It is two sequences of study like we have here at Davies where students are in their technical areas for two and ¼ hours a day. Would that be compared to two sequences of courses in a comprehensive high school in which the students have a 45-minute elective or career cluster and put two of those 45-minute segments together? Is that comparable to what we do here in a 2 ¼ hours of theory and practical session? Within that same context, are students going through those innovative programs, walking away with some kind of credential because it is hard for him to fathom that he knows how hard we work and try to have our kids walk away with a credential after three and ¼ years in one of our programs here at Davies. So to see students going through a 2 45-minutes segments in a comprehensive high school, he doesn't know what they will walk away with that will be comparable to what our kids walk away with. He is sure they will walk away with a credential but what weight will it hold compared to the credentials they get here. He is sure they will not match up. With two 45-minutes segments vs. 2 ½ hour sessions, the accountability piece was pretty important in that hearing in terms of how both sets of programs are going to be assessed and if they are going to be equal fitting.

V. Gailliard-Garrick said that it is about time the CTE regulations have been updated. They are a lot clearer. It pretty much defines the CTE System with the awareness exploration and career preparation, which is the heaviest piece obviously because they want those programs of study, whether it is an innovated one or whether it is a similar to the work we are doing here that have some quality of course _____. It doesn't appear so based on the current configuration of the programs of study. For instance, if she looks at a program of study outside of the Davies school and is a part of the application process for funding, you will see a program that is ninth grade there is nothing there, 10th grade there is nothing, and then you in 11th grade you have one course and in 12th grade you have another course. That is your 2 sequences of courses. Is that enough time on task to be industry recognized, the students to be industry-ready, and enough

time on task to qualify for advanced credits at a post-secondary institution? This is what the major concern is regarding the programs of study and looking at career and tech preparation programs. She believes there are some programs in the Davies region that are truly CTE preparation programs but she thinks you have to look at how it is going to be configured and designed by RIDE. Two sequences of courses is not enough to qualify as a preparation program at this point, but there is a journalism program at Lincoln that is a bonafide CTE preparation program that is above and beyond two sequences of courses.

The question now is siphoning of funding. The programs that are truly, in our mind, at a center or maybe even in some of the comprehensive high schools, is that money is going to be siphoned off to these programs that are not of quality whether at the Met Center or whether at comprehensive program. Even programs in the technical centers need to be improved upon. We have issues with some of our programs that are not meeting the expectations of standards.

Mr. Foley went back to the funding formula. We are having hard time getting this done with the money RIDE is giving us this year and 10 years down the line. Now we spread that pool of money even wider. They want more innovative programs so how do we do it without first making sure the model is funded to capacity. He asked Andrea Castenada, RIDE, who also sits on the commission with Mr. Foley, if she was saying that all of the programs will be held at the same high standards and rigor to get the funding, and she said "yes". He is hoping the new regs will indicate that the comprehensive programs will have to meet the same criteria that we have to in order to get the funding. What concerns him is if a student in Pawtucket wants to take Electrical and Pawtucket does not have one; we do. Pawtucket could say "because we have Carpentry and it is under that cluster classification, Pawtucket could say to that student, no you can't go to Davies because we have a cluster program that fits under the construction cluster and you will stay at Shea." That is what these new regs are saying. If it falls within the classification, that's enough to say to that student they will stay in Pawtucket. That concerns him. There is a price tag now to send that student to Davies so there is much more incentive to keep a kid within the district if they have their own program.

Ms. Cooley added that even though she is the enforcer of CTE at RIDE, she is also, quote-unquote, an advocate. Regarding the notion of standards, we have been working under a set of standards for a long time. Basically, what they have done if you look within the regulations, you will see there are revised standards in there also. In terms of CTE clusters, she went to the federal government because V. Gailliard-Garrick has been raising this cluster issue on a number of occasions. When she looked at other legislation around CTE, they all talk about a minimum of two sequences of courses. We have not talked about reviewing programs and looking at programs through the program approval process or the sequence of seat time. We are looking at quality. The element of what goes into the program of study is not necessarily the time that is associated with it. No matter what the program is, it will need RIDE approval, meet a set of standards. It is a standard driven conversation not necessarily a time driven conversation; the elements have to be in place. That was her response to the two sequences of courses. It isn't about time, it is about what they are composed of in terms of quality.

In all of her responses, these are draft regulations in that when all of the comments are out; they will go back and consider everything that is being said. She is not the end of the conversation. There is a team that is working on this. Some changes will occur in the regulations.

Regarding the program approval process, it is very important that we have a process to going out and approving these programs. The benchmark for that would be the standards, measuring the programs based on a set of standards. One of the things she is hoping for, and she has been an

advocate for, is grandfathering in the programs that have already been approved because we have taken a good look at four programs at Davies and she would like to see those programs grandfathered in. Credentials are one of the areas that is within the body of the standards. Davies Biotechnology Manufacturing is an excellent program. It is high quality; it meets the standards in most instances. Unfortunately, it doesn't offer credentials. We have to take into consideration programs that offer credentials vs. those that don't.

They have heard a lot about the notion of clusters in all of the public hearings. This is one of the areas we will most likely see some change. If a student wants a program, s/he should be able to access that program.

V. Gailliard-Garrick responded to seat time. She isn't thinking so much about seat time; she's thinking about desired results in the accountability piece whether it is in Biomanufacturing that doesn't have a credential to that program but you are looking at post-secondary advanced credits. If you look at what is required from the post-secondary end, the time they spend studying a particular course over a series or a span of years, what is required time-wise (which is a factor) in awarding those advanced credits. It is the same thing in the technical area programs, it is "desired results." When we look at desired results, you can't ignore how much time is spent to reach those desired results. With industry people, and we have them around this table, if you look at whether it is a NATEF or the NCCER, you are looking at desired results. There are credentials there that the industry people will say, "Okay for this particular credential, you have to have spent "x" amount of time and have acquired "x" amount of skill sets in that area. It is the same thing with post-secondary advanced credits. We go through the same process when formulating articulation agreements. Although RIDE isn't looking at it as not time, you need to look at it from the perspective of desired results and how we are going to get to that and what is going to constitute the types of skill sets and the amount of time to get those desired results that will be looked at.

Dr. Segovis shares V. Gailliard-Garrick's concern. He would like to see more about quality. That the state needs to emphasize on more programs that would build excellence and that isn't what he is seeing in the draft. It is more about the minimum vs. we should be pushing on the other. His fear is we will have more awareness programs and the two course minimum sets a low bar vs. we should be aiming toward credentialing programs. We are not going to pull the state out of this recession. We will not be job creators because the students are graduating unprepared in industries that are growing. He would like to see more of that wording in the document; otherwise, we are aiming for the least which is about funding and not about the best which forces the funding to rise.

Dr. Segovis thanked Ms. Cooley for coming. She ended with announcing that there is a final hearing the next day at the East Providence High School so if there is anyone who wants to make a comment please feel free to attend. At this point, issues that are not raised in the public forum cannot be addressed by the team. If there is something we feel has not been said, we need to say it publicly so that they can go back into the draft regulations and by law change them. November 29th is the deadline for submitting issues in writing.

Mr. Foley distributed a copy of a list of his concerns he is sending to Senator Gallo and the agenda of the next Commission meeting. Based on the agenda, the commissioner heard the message on all of the issues we discussed today, transportation and long-term and short-term solutions to the funding formula. On his list of concerns, there is the issue of the per-pupil cost. Ms. Dias kept saying, "Where is the empirical data?" Well he is asking where is the empirical data regarding the transportation cost? He sits on this commission as NEARI rep, not as Davies

rep. Senator Gallo is very supportive of CTE. It's amazing to him that RIDE's own legislative liaison didn't know the transportation was put in the legislation and his comment was, "oh that has to be changed." He doesn't think they understood what the detrimental effects was going to be to us and it seems we have people who are listening but what comes out of it is different. He is optimistic to see these three items on the commission's meeting agenda. We will come out that meeting with some recommendations to the General Assembly on those issues. The commission will also be sending a letter on the regulations.

Cheryl Carroll added that even though Mr. Foley mentioned that he is only representing NEA, but he could not be a better Davies advocate on that commission he is sitting on. He has been phenomenal. He isn't afraid to speak his mind even though he is clearly showing his Davies hat. It is really appreciated. Dr. Segovis thanked him for his help.

He wanted the board to also know that there was one Board of Regent here at the public hearing and that just doesn't show that they want to hear what we have to say. Dr. Segovis wants to draft a letter to RIDE with his name on behalf of the Board addressing our concerns to the drafted CTE regs. If it is a long letter, so be it.

4) **Results of the NEASC Five-Year Focus Visit – October 3-5, 2011 –**
V. Gailliard-Garrick, Director

5) **Other**

The Teacher Tenure Act Hearing is on December 1st. It is imperative that all of the trustees be here. Another notice will go out stating this is a very critical. We will have witnesses and testimonies just like you see in court just a little less formal. A notice will be going out to the teacher this week. This is a teacher tenure act hearing, but there is also a civil suit that the parents are bringing and they are actually supporting this in regards to the civil suit also. There is the criminal act as well. The board will go into Executive Session after the testimony is heard to deliberate and make a decision.

Is this in lieu of the December 5th Board meeting? No it isn't. Dr. Segovis thought it was important to hold the meeting for follow-up to what was heard today. We will aim for sometime the week of Dec. 12th.

V. Adjournment

At 10:00 a.m., Dr. Segovis asked for a motion to adjourn and all were in favor.