

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

Board of Trustees

Minutes of the Regular Meeting
March 5, 2012

Minutes were approved at the April 2, 2012 Board meeting.

I. Routine

A. Call Meeting to Order

At 8:12 am, 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; Paul Ouellette;
James Segovis, Ph.d., *Chairperson*; Robin Smith

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

Others Present: Victoria A. Gailliard-Garrick; Joanne Andrews; Cheryl Carroll;
Bernie Blumenthal; Susan Paquin, Scott Conley

C. Approval of Minutes

A quorum was not present; therefore, the approval of the Feb. 6, 2012 meeting was deferred until the April meeting.

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 postponed to the end of the agenda.

E. Return to Regular Session

N/A at this point on the agenda

F. Opportunity for Audience to Comment

N/A

II. Business Agenda

A. Finance Report – Cheryl Carroll, Business Office Coordinator
The Met began the introduction of legislation. Dennis Litkey reached out to RIDE to inform them that they are submitting legislation if passed, it would impact Davies and the Met. From our perspective, it would very favorably impact us. Mr. Litkey, out of courtesy, notified RIDE about it and it was not very well received because it involves changes to the Commissioner's coveted funding formula. Two major things within this bill if passed as proposed, it would add an automatic, consistent, weighted formula onto this new per pupil

core amount that we now get in our budget. It would give an automatic bump-up on every student who comes to Davies and the Met representing the cost to provide CTE for those students. Right now, instead of us having to hope that a pool of funds, called Categorical CTE funds, would get put aside and would have to apply for those funds, this would be an automatic given add-on to the base that would represent the cost to do CTE. It would take the competitiveness and an uncertainty out of the picture with this automatic add-on factor.

The second piece of this is we have all been complaining about starting this past July, we are now responsible for funding the district transportation to and from Davies each day. This would basically say that RIDE would set aside from their pool of transportation funds, an automatic set-aside for Davies and the Met covering us in full for the regionalization nature of our schools and the fact that kids do not come from our local communities.

This bill, if passed, will cover two big holes within our budget. It would do a 33% add-on to the core amount per pupil to cover CTE. For the transportation piece, it would cover 100%. RIDE made it clear when Dennis Litkey reached out to Carolyn Dias, she tried to talk him out of this legislation. She didn't think it was a good idea for anyone to attempt to try to touch the Commissioner's funding formula. (This is a paraphrase.)

The Met wants to partner with Davies to help push this bill through. What does Davies Board think about such an alignment, partnership in pushing through this legislation? Davies has always enjoyed a very good and stellar reputation in what we do. Sometimes people have had mixed reactions to the MET Career and Technical Center. Naturally this is favorable for us; we just want to make sure no one has any gut reaction or feedback for us. At this point, what do we have to lose because we are on the path to financial devastation as we work toward a full phase-in of the funding formula? The Met joining forces with Davies will never be a bad thing because Davies has an excellent reputation and credibility in any circle. We just want to make sure a full-blown joining of the forces isn't met with anything other than a decent reaction from the Board and that you would support that we do so.

David Carlin, a lobbyist, Mr. Ouellette doesn't see any issue with him testifying on this. Mr. Ouellette will just give him the number of the bill and he'll make sure he is available to testify. He is very good at what he does. It's all about the facts with him. He will go to bat for this. Does anyone know when it will come up? We don't have the House companion bill number or official sponsorship yet. The Senate side has been referred to Senate Finance. Once the committee's agenda comes out, Ms. Carroll will let him know. Mr. Ouellette thinks it will come up very quickly because the legislators are looking at getting done very early this year, end of May or early June.

A vote can't be taken because there is no quorum, but Dr. Segovis asked for everyone's thoughts on it. Mr. Boisselle feels it is really great for the Met to attach itself to Davies but he isn't too sure it's good for Davies to be attaching itself to the Met. They could drag us down. Dennis is a very controversial guy, but if it is going to be a packaged deal, we definitely can move forward with it.

We just need to play it down as much as we can. Davies is not on their coat tails; the Met is on ours and how do we get that point across?

Dr. Segovis thinks it has to be seen as the legislators are pushing it rather than us. It should be the legislators saying, “what is going on; this is important.” Is that a way to soften it? Yes, coming from them rather than us is definitely a plus. Mr. Ouellette asked if there was a way to separate from the Met and there isn’t; it’s all or nothing. Is there a choice then after you look at the alternative? Is McNamara still on the Education Committee because he was very instrumental in getting the electrical earned credits legislation through for the CTE students? Dr. Segovis keeps looking at the downside. RIDE isn’t going to give us anymore money. They don’t listen. We don’t want to make enemies with RIDE, but the Commissioner has done nothing to make our lives more manageable. It’s not like it will be done behind their backs. Ms. Dias gave the Commissioner the heads-up on this.

Mr. Chartier heard in the past there was an old formula to set up multiple vocational education centers around the state and there is still some discussion about it with the legislators. Mrs. Gailliard-Garrick was surprised to hear this. We really need to push our type of education and we have to be part of a solution. He knows a few senators are not too happy with the Commissioner. We need this money. He doesn’t know the Regents and he doesn’t know the Commissioner well, but he does know that as a parent, we want to keep this school moving forward and if the Commissioner isn’t going to help us, then we need to fend for ourselves. He gets the feeling sitting on this Board that Carolyn Dias is not our friend; she has a different agenda. To him this bill is a positive for this school and we need to get funding wherever we can get it. Davies is here; the Met is over there, we are just joining forces to get this legislation passed.

The other ten districts are not supporting this because they have a formula for tuition which is above and beyond the local share that we get. They are trying to standardize the formula. Unlike Davies and the Met, they are calling out for local share tuition and there is no equity in the amount of money we get for the local share among our sending districts, e.g., Smithfield \$11,000 and Central Falls \$300-\$500, where in a Warwick or a Cranston, they are getting \$15,000 per student. They would not have a role in this.

Mrs. Gailliard-Garrick asked for clarification. There was a report back in 1990 in restructuring career and technical education and in that report it was stated they would like to create “x” number of Davies type models around the state. Davies was one and the Providence C & T was the second one. She asked Mr. Chartier if they were still looking at that model. “Yes”, they know career and technical education is very important. It is very expensive for the cities and towns to operate their own schools. Davies is still considered the gem and how we go about being the gem. We really need to get the rest of the state involved. If they build five centers around the state and build on the Davies model, then it becomes more powerful. Mrs. Gailliard-Garrick asked because it is totally against what the new CTE regs are saying about access to career and tech education, spreading it out statewide. That is why she was surprised to hear it was still being thought of.

Dr. Segovis ended this discussion by saying, from the sense of what he is hearing, and not to speak for the trustees who are absent, he doesn't want to speak for them but he believes they would not disagree, he thinks there is more upside in doing this, joining forces. He would betray it as, "yes" we are going to join forces because our own representatives, senators, parents have been saying the same thing. We can't keep losing money; we need to be maintaining resources or getting more. He thinks it is critical to coordinate with Mr. Litkey and to continue to work with the legislators on this. Carolyn Dias still thinks we are a science lab so we have to push ahead and take the risk on this one. We have to put the issue on the table publically. Get them to understand the issues; focus on the facts, and keep pounding it home.

The Met is asking to meet with us this week. Mrs. Gailliard-Garrick would like to include either Scott Conley or Bill Foley who have been instrumental in proposing the same type of legislative changes to the funding formula. She will give the board a summary of what will happen at that meeting. What do we have to lose? This is the time to invest not to begin losing resources. With Mr. Litkey, the message to him should be we are supporting the legislation, and how can we do it with our people and how does he do it with his people. Mrs. Gailliard-Garrick just wants some background information first. How did it all come about and who they have been dealing with so she will get a better understanding of what the playing field is going to look like. Will they want us to present with them on the Senate and the House side? Based on previous discussions, it is all about the local share piece because it is not going to cover what we need to educate these students on the tech side, on the academic side, yes. Then there is the transportation piece so the bill certainly covers the two big major concerns. It is just how we are going to present it.

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

Lay-off notices were distributed on February 17th and we have received the appeal letters from the members. Mrs. Gailliard-Garrick spoke to Mr. Foley. He knows they are all budgetary so he would like to have the hearing sometime in June. This is where Mrs. Gailliard-Garrick has concerns about this legislation. The Met doesn't have concerns with the edgy-job funds like we receive and a lot of our lay-off notices are based on that federal grant. We are relying heavily on the state; the Governor put it in his budget, and RIDE will come forward and speak on our behalf to make us whole there. So she is concerned that RIDE will not come forward and speak pro-restoring those funds to us if we join forces with the Met and get this legislation passed. It is a substantial amount of money, close to \$1,000,000.

Ms. Carroll added that joining forces with the MET is a double-edge sword. A part of her says, "What do we have to lose?" It could be other resources such as a review of a Perkins application sometime. There could be in some other way that RIDE will get back at us. She truly feels it is a double-edge sword. Dr. Segovis said we will cross that road when we get there. We need the support to still be there, but that support has been questionable anyway of late. We cannot live in fear and if we stay where we are, we are going nowhere. We are only going downhill. It is an erosion of a model.

We have two good trustees who know the state; we have contacts to pull the legislators together; and we need to start contacting them to get them all on the same page. Dr. Segovis would communicate it this way. It is not necessarily a Davies initiative but a parent, student and their representatives' initiative. We are only carriers of the message that people do not want this to happen. If they don't like it, then talk to our representatives and explain to them why they are cheating the kids. It is less about us; it's more about this is what we represent. Let the legislators and the parents carry this. It is time for people to speak up. If it is a value to them, then they need to speak up.

C. Board Appointments — Victoria A. Gailliard-Garrick, Director

We are awaiting for the Board of Regents to pass the changes to their by-laws. Mrs. Gailliard-Garrick received a copy of those changes and they pertain to the appointment of board members of the four state-operated: The Met, Davies, School for the Deaf, and Central Falls. They are looking at a new process on how they appoint these people, how they accept these appointments, and the number of terms they can serve on these boards. At this point, she is assuming over the next month or so they will approve those by-laws.

She does not think it is a concern of ours as a board. It's a major concern for the Met and who they are selecting for their board members. They are making selections that do not really pertain to business/industry and education. It is the same thing at the School for the Deaf. They have had some problems with turnover with the Central Falls Board of Trustees as well. She thinks it pertains to these reasons, but she is not positive.

Dr. Segovis would like to see if the Regents' could at least expedite Mr. Bone and Mr. Brown's nomination approval. To him, they are natural fits for our board and there shouldn't be any problem approving them. Also under Dr. Segovis's signature, pen a letter to Mr. Bone and Mr. Brown explaining to them the process and why there is a delay. Mrs. Gailliard-Garrick will contact Angela Teixeira, the Special Assistant to the Regents.

III. Informational Time/Program Updates

A. Director's Report

1) **Davies Teachers' Association** – *Scott Conley, Vice President*
On Saturday, NEARI had a "Great Public Schools Across America" Expo at the Warwick Mall. Mr. Blumenthal was there along with some teachers. Kristen St. Pierre, recently hired English Teacher volunteered to set up a booth. Frank Barcellos, Electrical; Holly Hunt, English, and Carla Wardyga, English/ESL teachers also attended. They were there all day and since it is election year, a lot of politicians attended. Mr. Conley was told it was a great success. There was a lot of interaction with people.

We were also successful in getting some legislation submitted on the House side. It's a House companion bill that was in the Senate. Rep. Petraca is sponsoring the bill.

Dr. Segovis added that union negotiations is coming up. The administration will start its process and hoping the union will as well. Next step is to schedule some

meetings. Mr. Egan will not be the union's representative because he is retiring. Jay Walsh will be their new uniserv. He is a Regent for Higher Education. Once we get a sense of our budget, we will be able to start communication.

Mrs. Gailliard-Garrick and Mrs. Andrews have been working on a draft proposal so the parties can sit down, meet, and discuss.

2) Davies Teacher Assistants' Association

No representation present.

3) School-wide Goals – School Improvement Plan [SIP] – Mrs. Gailliard-Garrick, Director

See Supplemental Material: "Davies Strategic/School Improvement Plan 2011-2014" PowerPoint handout.

Every two to three years we have to develop a school improvement plan for RIDE. This one is very different from previous years. The framework of this plan is prescribed by RIDE. Due to the money they received from The Race-to-the Top, they prescribed everything from instruction, facilities, information communications, and what it is they want schools to do in their LEA district wide educational system. This document pretty much reflects quite a bit of that and you will see in parentheses the BEP, Secondary Regulations, and the CTE regs notations after some of the goals. That means they are embedded into those goals.

The handout lists the structural systems of the school and their goals. The mission statement was derived from a training session with the teachers during a professional development day. They were asked to review the current statement and to give her feedback on where they think we are with it, what they are happy with, and where they would like the mission statement to go. This new mission statement is reflective of that.

This plan is just being proposed at this point. Mrs. Gailliard-Garrick would like the Board to share their thoughts, add something, if they are not comfortable with the language, she will make those changes. It all ties into the Basic Education Program, the education platform throughout RI, what RIDE wants to see in the schools. She will be presenting this to her department chairs as well as her management team. She has been meeting with them on and off for the last two months gathering all of this information and trying to make some sense around it; embracing what it is that we need to do.

Dr. Segovis asked about a vision statement. He believes there is one out of the Board retreat. A vision always comes before a mission. You will see throughout this plan that this is a culmination of what came out of the retreat.

The Guiding Principles are two-fold. The one in the handout talks about the educational environment, teaching and learning, instruction and effective teaching, but she is also looking at having the teachers come up with some learning principles because when you look at the bullets, we talk about long-term standards and desired results for teaching and learning. We as a school have to decide what they are to look like. What are they, where are we

going, what do we want and what do we want our students to be able to do? The last bullet is more important than anything else. People need to be committed and willing to accept those principles when it comes to teaching and learning. So you need to get staff involvement with this, their buy-in, and then you will get their commitment if they have been a part of the process in coming up with the learning principles.

Again, a lot of the goals came out the BEP (Basic Education Program), mandates and regulations. For example, the first bullet under Part I of the Instructional Operations, this is new. The commissioner wants policies and procedures written for everything we do in our educational system here at Davies: teaching, learning, assessments, and evaluations of the programs. This is a lot of work that has to be done in conjunction with the teachers and the administrators.

Mrs. Gailliard-Garrick pretty much keeps up with all the new literature that comes out of RIDE as well at the Federal level. There is a big push for analyzing and closing the gaps with at-risk students so there is a goal that addresses this. What are we going to do for those kids at-risk who are not meeting proficiency? That is where we have our Academic Recovery Program, our Afternoon Classes, our Reading remedial classes. Every year she looks at the data that comes out of those classes. Everything has to be data-driven and rightfully so. That is how we determine if they are effective or needs to be tweaked.

At another time Mrs. Gailliard-Garrick will give the Board a presentation on the changes of the Secondary Regulations. She gave one to parents last September. It talks about moving kids toward proficiency, the kids who are at-risk, and the types of things we have to establish for them. They also want an Individual Learning Plan based on where these kids are, data-driven, where we are going and how we are measuring them to meet proficiency.

Mrs. Gailliard-Garrick wrote all of these goals. She received input from the management team and they tweaked and re-wrote them based on what is in the BEP and Secondary Regulations.

Regarding the last goal in Part I of the Instructional Operations, Mrs. Smith asked if it would make sense to include increasing the number of articulation agreements. Mrs. Gailliard-Garrick said, "Yes." That is in another section. What she did was two things. This is more so for Mr. Manning and Mr. Blumenthal. They are going to partner with this on their personalized goals. Also under each of these goals there will be strategies. There are many of them and she felt it would take too long to go through them here. So under this goal, there will be a strategy that pertains to articulation agreements.

This is a three-year plan aligned with the Race to the Top and its remaining years. Some of it we already have in place. We are going to tweak some of it. With the CTE Regs., there is going to be a shift from the NECAP state-wide testing to the PARC Assessment Test. They are requiring district-wide, standardized testing that is related to and a part of the evaluation system. We are moving toward that right now to obtain baseline data. We are looking a

changes in curriculum with the Common Core Standards and looking at assessments annually using the district-wide testing before they institute the state-wide assessment, the PARC.

Regarding the Part II Instructional Operations bullets, they address professional development. Under the first goal, the strategies will address providing professional development for teachers to understand data, analyze it, and interpret that data to improve student achievement. We have to get on board and understand data and how to use it effectively to move towards better student performance outcomes and meeting those proficiency requirements.

With the first bullet under Business Operations, Mrs. Smith suggested adding prioritizing the repairs and upgrades. It is very helpful. Dr. Segovis would like to see a list of all the school's technology equipment and their age. Mrs. Smith is right on target because under the BEP there is new language. They are asking for an Educational Facilities Master Plan and within that plan they want us to create a Capital Asset Plan that provides some insight and appropriateness for some of the projects that we do. That is under Mr. Okerholm who is responsible for the Facilities Operations. Mrs. Smith will send us CCRI's spreadsheet that they use. Mrs. Gailliard-Garrick will compare it to the one RIDE wants us to use. Mrs. Gailliard-Garrick will change the language in the Facilities Operations goals to reflect that master plan language.

Mrs. Gailliard-Garrick continued to go through the goals of the Business, Human Resources, Business Partnerships and Information Technology Operations. She has asked Mr. Blumenthal and Mr. Manning to partner to develop more articulation agreements and partnerships. The partnerships we are currently looking at are with Brown University for our Health Careers and BioTech programs, Sensata, and Xerox.

The next step is what is here will go out to the Management Team to work on the objectives and action steps. The Board realized it was a ton of good work.

4) **Proposed Amendments to the Funding Formula** —Mrs. Gailliard-Garrick, Director

This report was included in the Finance Report.

5) **Davies Video Update** — Bernie Blumenthal, Business and Education Partnerships Coordinator

Mrs. Gailliard-Garrick asked Mr. Blumenthal to take the lead to develop a new video that markets Davies and the programs that we have. He had an opportunity to look at some videos but he found that Mediapeel would be an excellent company for us to engage in. They would develop a master video. What is meant by that is they would have an opportunity to create one video for us that we could utilize to market the school, marketing to perspective students, to perspective partners and enhance the image of Davies while we focus on what makes us work. This master video could also be divided into smaller vignettes so that we could have a video that can show a tour of the

school, show testimonials (talk with students, our Trustees, etc.). We have an opportunity here to develop a real professional video and do it in a timely basis. In working with Mediapeel, we could actually finish this by the end of April, early May.

When he first saw Mediapeel, he was really impressed. If you have seen PC or URI's athletic videos, they are an example of what Mediapeel has done. When he went through the tour with Larry Gemma, he didn't realize Mediapeel was a part of Gem Company. It is a separate company but under the same umbrella. You may have read in the paper that they have merged with Alex and Ani and has moved to Cranston so there will be no conflict with Mr. Gemma being on the Board. It won't be a problem but we should still get an advisory opinion from the Ethics Commission. Mediapeel is Anthony Gemma's company and he wanted to merge with Alex and Ani so he could run for Congress. Then there will be no problem then. There are a number of things we can do. Mr. Gemma can refrain from voting.

It will need to be done in a timely fashion because Mediapeel wants to get this going, but now there is the problem of going out to bid because it is over \$5000.

When Mr. Blumenthal met with Mr. Motta from Mediapeel, it was just a preliminary meeting but he did tell him that people need to start looking at Davies differently and that is the message we want to communicate in the video. This has to be the leading part of the video. Very quickly, he needs to know who should be in the video for the next step. Mrs. Gailliard-Garrick wants the message sent out that we do prepare students for post-secondary education and career training. Dr. Segovis also wants to emphasis all the modern programming we are doing such as Robotics instead of just cosmetology. Mr. Chartier also would like to see former students in the video promoting Davies.

Within the next week, Mr. Blumenthal needs to know what the focus will be for this video and who will be the key players. Now that we have to go out to bid, that will take us a little bit longer. Mrs. Smith suggested using CCRI and Mr. Ouellette suggested NEIT because they will do it for free.

The focus was already discussed but which ever trustee who will work, even past trustees such as Tom Tanury or Mike Ferdinandi. The Gemmas themselves are much respected.

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 9:30 a.m., Dr. Segovis asked for a motion to recess into Executive Session. Mrs. Smith made the motion to recess into Executive Session pursuant to R.I.G.L 42.46-5 (A) (1) and (2) to discuss pending litigation and personnel issues; Mr. Chartier seconded the motion; and all were in favor.

Return to Regular Session

At 9:40 a.m., Dr. Segovis asked for a motion to recess out of Execution Session.

Mr. Ouellette 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; Mrs. Smith made the motion; Mr. Ouellette seconded the motion and all were in favor.

The Board is five members short and everyone needs to begin thinking about people including committed parents who would be an asset to the Board and Davies. Bring the names to the next meeting.

V. Adjournment

At 9:43 a.m., Dr. Segovis asked for a motion to adjourn and all were in favor.