

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

Board of Trustees

Minutes of the Regular Meeting
December 14, 2015

Minutes were accepted that the Jan. 11, 2016 Board meeting.

I. Routine

A. Call Meeting to Order

At 5:07 p.m., Mrs. Carolyn Kyle, Chairperson, called the meeting to order.

B. Attendance

Davies' Executive Assistant called the roll of the Board.

Members Present: Harold Burns; Robert Halkyard; Carolyn Kyle, *Chairperson*; David Marquis; Paul Ouellette; Robin Smith

Members Absent: James Bone; Raymond Chartier; Larry Gemma; George Nee; John Quinn, *Vice-Chairperson*; James Segovis, Ph.D.

Others Present: David Champagne; Frank Engels; Victoria Gailliard-Garrick; Joanne Andrews; Chery Carroll; A. Flynn; Gerry Manning; Susan Paquin; Fred Slemon; Susan Tierney

C. Approval of Minutes

There was no quorum present so the approval of the Nov. 9, 2015 minutes was deferred until the January 2016 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

There were no agenda items for the Executive Session.

E. Return to Regular Session

N/A

F. Opportunity for Audience to Comment

There was no audience.

II. Business Agenda

A. Finance Report – C. Carroll, Business Office Coordinator

Ms. Carroll has been sitting in on the Governor's Funding Formula Committee meetings that V. Gailliard-Garrick sits on. It will be interesting to see what they come up with. We can only hope, there will be a recommendation from that committee that will help us. It has been an interesting ride and they added an additional meeting on January 11th. Even though this committee has not given a lot of voice and seat time to CTE, V. Gailliard-Garrick has made it known about her displeasure about it. Had she not spoken up, CTE would have been a 15 minute discussion in all of these weeks long of meetings they have been sitting at and attending. Fingers cross as it becomes interesting to see what recommendations what will come out of it.

In terms of the budget, Mrs. Kyle asked if there are any surprised expenses this far in. “No.” V. Gailliard-Garrick is a “glass half full” person so she always feels there is hope with the discussions around CTE and the recommendations she provided to them on how they can balance our budget. It has been tossed around about holding Davies harmless and funding us 100%. There has been discussions with RIDE about that through their finance director, but V. Gailliard-Garrick doesn’t believe that is going to be the answer. A few recommendations she made to the group was of course the “add-on factor” cost for career and tech education. She is going to look at other states to see what they look like in comparison and share that information with them at the next meeting. Another recommendation was the transportation categorical funding which is about \$600,000 for the year for us. If they can include us as a regional school instead of a “charter or public school of choice,” the state can cover that transportation cost. The third recommendation is the way they fund the other CTE centers. They are tuition based that can run from \$15,000-\$25,000 per pupil vs. the funding we get through the funding formula methodology. It varies from district to district but it is nowhere near the money that they get. Lincoln’s superintendent just received a bill for \$16,000 from Ponagansett because a Lincoln student is in their Agriculture program. The superintendent didn’t even know that student was there.

In summary, on the 1.6 million that was proposed for us in our budget next year, that would be the number that would make us whole. Supplemental funding is what we need support for to be pushed through with the legislature. Instead of reducing our budget by 1.6 million, we left it in there and then they came back to us saying they put in a line-item in their budget for supplemental funds. We will see what happens with that. RIDE is well aware that they cannot continue to fund us like this for us to continue with our services. They admitted it; how they are going to do it; that is the big question.

For the board, so that everyone is talking and asking for the same thing at the State House, Mrs. Kyle asked V. Gailliard-Garrick for some talking points/a brag sheet that came from the document that was sent along with the budget proposal explaining why we left the 1.6 million in it. If we reinforce the same message, that would be a lot more powerful. Mr. Ouellette asked if RIDE recognizes that they cannot continue with this formula for Davies, he thought there was some hope. V. Gailliard-Garrick believes there is hope. What they are going to do to address it, she has no idea. She doesn’t think going back to be funded at 100% is going to happen because it will cause too much of a rift with the other districts. She is hoping that they will do the added cost factor for CTE and look at the transportation. Over the next 2-3 weeks, the Funding Formula working group will be looking at these recommendations. They spent a lot of time on Special Ed and ELL. V. Gailliard-Garrick spoke about the inequities in how they fund career and technical education. Davies is stand-alone high school that provides academics and career and tech prep looking at \$12-13,000 per student vs the \$19,000 that we need; then you have a Ponagansett school that also has academic instruction, but their preparation of the technical is not the same. Plus it isn’t one of the emerging industries.

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

A communications/marketing specialist has been hired, Fallon Masterson who started at the end of November. We finally got approval for a janitor position that we have been waiting forever on with a start date, hopefully, at the end of December. The Teacher Assistant union is looking for a negotiation date. Mr. Ragosta is working with Mr. Cobleigh to make sure we have some dates in January. A small group will get together first to go over the language. There shouldn’t be too many changes. Mrs. Kyle would like as advance notice as possible.

Regarding the Communications/Marketing Specialist, Mrs. Gailliard-Garrick met with Ms. Masterson and she will be coming to the Board meeting in January to do a PowerPoint presentation on the research she has done with Davies website and some of the recommendations she has for it. She is looking at a different designs. She also shared some interesting data relative to number of

users, the audience that is using the site, etc. She will report this out to the Board as well. She was a great choice.

III. Informational Time/Program Update

A. Director's Report

1) Davies Teachers' Association

No representation present.

2) Davies Teacher Assistants' Association

No representation present.

3) 2016-2017 Admissions Testing – *Victoria Gailliard-Garrick, Director*

As of Dec. 5th, we tested 559 students for the incoming 9th grade class which is a great number. It is pretty much in line with the numbers we have had previously so our grassroots campaign worked. Mrs. Gailliard-Garrick doesn't know how many of those students will be eligible until we do the 2nd tier testing. Mr. Slemon has about 60 students who need to be 2nd-tiered tested, IEP students. We don't know how many ELL students need it because the process is a little more time-consuming. The ELL teacher has to go through a RIDE on-line system to find out which of those 559 students are ELL.

Mrs. Gailliard-Garrick also spoke to Mr. Abbott about the Board's comments regarding his decision on the revised admissions policy. He said he would come to a Board meeting if the trustees would like to speak about it further. Basically, he is saying it is discriminatory. We could do it only if we did it for every single student but that defeats the whole purpose. However, she has been asking for their final report cards before determining acceptance. She does look at the attendance, teacher comments, as well as the passing grade of 70 and makes a determination. This kind of balances out what we were trying to do with the second part of the policy. Mr. Abbott was okay with students had to pass all core subjects with a 70, the sibling policy, and the passing the entrance exam with a 6 in both the Reading and the Math. The only problem he had was with the second part of that where we were looking at interviewing the students. This is the discriminatory concern that he had.

We can have Mr. Abbott come in or she can just take out the interview part and just continue to do what she has been doing and have that approved. The problem we had with the report card in the past was the passing grade is different in each sending district so we now make sure the prospective parents are aware that Davies passing grade is a 70 and they know they have to work toward that to get into Davies. If not, they are then told they must go to summer school if they want to get accepted.

Mrs. Kyle asked Mrs. Gailliard-Garrick, as an educator, how she felt about removing the interview piece. As an educator, especially if you are looking at teacher comments that are a part of the report card, you can get a decent profile on who that student is without the interview. When you interview a student for entrance, it is interest and motivation that you are really looking at. Mrs. Kyle said if you look at the cohort coming in from communities that have a lot of issues, you can certainly pick up on some things in an interview in terms of aspiration of where he or she wants to be, what their motivations might be, that the report card may not reflect. The motivation would be because you can see it in their grades, but the interest, no. Mrs. Gailliard-Garrick feels it is getting better, but too often, kids come here for the wrong reasons because their families want them here where it is safe and secure vs. their sending school districts. Then there is the report that is presented to the board in June about the number of students going onto post-secondary education and the number was 71% last year and 57% of them were staying in their technical areas. It looks like we are getting good kids coming here based on those outcomes.

Since Mrs. Gailliard-Garrick is comfortable not including the interviews, it will not be necessary to invite Mr. Abbott to a board meeting for further discussion.

Mrs. Smith was at a Providence CT Academy advisory board meeting and they were interested in developing a placement data report. She asked if she could share last year's report with them. Mrs. Gailliard-Garrick suggested talking about it with Mrs. Smith privately. Since it is a template, she told Mrs. Smith that she could share it with them with no data, but it goes both ways. She has a difficult time getting information from them and she did a lot of work for them before they opened that building up: scheduling, job specs, certifications and she asked them for a copy of a curriculum just to see if we were going in the right direction with the work they did with the Dana Center. She was told, They can't release it."

4) PARCC Results – Adam Flynn, Supervisor of Academic Instruction

See supplemental material: "PARCC 2014 Performance."

PARCC data was released last month and we are in the process of analyzing it locally. Mr. Flynn shared it out to the Department Coordinators; we started some protocols that we are doing to determine what the appropriate adjustments are to make based on these results. There is high level information and all he pulled out of it was our overall performance, our sub-group performance, and district comparison.

The first chart, "PARCC 2014 ELA Performance," has the overall performance in ELA (blue bar) and then it is broken down by Grade 9 and Grade 10 (orange and gray bars.) Unlike NECAP, students can now obtain one of 5 proficiency levels. It used to be 4. What is considered to be college and/or career ready is Level 4 or higher. So you can see we, like the rest of the state and every other state in the PARCC consortium, has some work to do. We already noted that there is a marked difference between the 9th and 10th grade performance. We are looking into what could be the cause of that which is obviously, like anything in education, there are tons of variables that could lead to that, but we are trying to investigate what they are with the English Dept.

When you look at the Sub-group Performance chart you will see that most of the bars are close to each other indicating that we have minimal gaps between our different sub-groups except for obviously the yellow and green which is the same issue we had with the NECAP. Our English Language Learners and IEP students continue to have a pretty large performance gap. Again, the same throughout the state. Every school had that same issue. We are still doing a really good job at keeping our Black/African American students and Hispanic students pretty much even with the general population which is a good sign because other schools have large achievement gaps with them as well. We still, again, need to look back at curriculum, look back at programming, what we need to do to support IEP and ELL students more. We are working on that now in departments.

What is Level 5 again? Level 4 is called "meeting expectations and Level 5 is "exceeding expectations." What the PARCC Consortium considers to be college or career ready is being a Level 4 or 5. If you hit either one of those, they say that you are ready to move onto the next grade level and that you will be employable upon graduation for an entry-level position or ready for college level courses without remediation. A lot of the students fell on Level 3 which is "nearly meeting expectations." 2 is "approaching expectations." Mr. Flynn is trying to get clarification what they mean between nearly meeting and approaching but no one can tell him. 1 is "substantially below meeting expectations."

The next two charts shows the results on the Math performance. Shockingly, this was an assessment where our Math results were actually slightly better than our ELA which is new for us. Again, there are lots of questions on why that is and we are just in the initial phases of exploring that with a lot of protocols. Same exact type of data, blue is all math, orange is Algebra I, and gray is Geometry. These are the required assessments with the same performance levels. You will see a shift in the sub-group performance but again the gaps we have to address are the same with ELL and IEP students. "Low SES" sub-group are those students who are from

a low socio-economic families and about 68% of our students fall into this group (free or reduced lunch population). If you have 10 or more students in one of these cohorts, than RIDE will count that cohort into the school's performance data.

The last two charts with a lot of bars, is the district comparisons for ELA and for Math. If you have been following the conversation around PARCC statewide, what is a really good accomplishment for us is the "Participation" column, 99% participation in English and 98% in Math is huge. There were high schools in the state with as low as 20% participation and you can imagine, if you have participation like that you may as well through your results out the window. You can't do anything with them. With Sue Tierney's help with getting those computers up and running, we were able to test pretty much every student. We didn't have an opt-out problem and Mr. Flynn doesn't think we will have one this year.

We did pretty well compared to the usual suspects we out-perform. We were out-performed by some districts as usual and the only other thing that could be misleading is with Providence. It looks like they did pretty well. They had one high school with a very, very high participation and that was Classical so their results are skewed. When you pull Classical out, they go right back to everybody else.

The statewide conversation is that none of this should be shocking. None of this should surprise us. It is in line with SATs, ACTs, NAPE, NECAP and every other assessment tells us the same thing. Basically, it is back to work.

Mrs. Kyle thanked Mr. Flynn for all the work he puts into this and she also thanked Sue Tierney for getting this all to work, great teamwork. Mr. Burns asked if we can expect to reach the state average. Mr. Flynn believes we will surpass the state average. The next thing we will be doing besides all of the work with the departments, is going back and seeing what type of growth we got each year with the NECAP and then set some goals to exceed that growth rate so that we can at least surpass our old results especially with the Math. This plan is one of the key result areas with the Strategic Plan Roadmap.

- 5) Update on Davies Building Committee Work – Cheryl Carroll, Business Office Coordinator**
On Dec. 18th, at 10:30 a.m., an important Building Committee meeting is scheduled. There was a bit of stall in getting our Master Plan Coordinator on board, into the trenches looking at the work that was done by our Current Conditions Coordinator folks, etc. At this upcoming meeting, we will review the work that has been done on the current conditions study and determine if he felt it was thin or adequate in the scope that we paid for, for the work. He will have a lot of feedback for us in that regard because our planner has reviewed the whole scope of the current conditions of the building. He also wants to go over with us timelines as he sees this unfolding because nothing with the State moves fast. Right now he has a schedule that would have the completion of all of these plans ready to begin putting teeth into asking for the funding. He has this right now scheduled out to May of 2017 which put our funding request as a Fiscal 18 request. So the work kind of lags because we wear a State hat.

There are two Board representatives on the committee, Mr. Gemma and Mr. Chartier. Mr. Gemma was beneficial in getting a Lincoln town representation to sit on the committee, Mr. Roger Pierce, Building Inspector for Lincoln. He will join us at that meeting as well. We feel we have a little bit of the town covered to the extent when we get to the point where we may significantly change the footprint, Lincoln will have been part of the conversation. Everyone is looking forward to this meeting because we need to kick it into gear and get it going.

Mr. Burns asked if we knew what was driving the schedule so late. In large part, it has to do with part two of our plan being the educational study component, the demographics, our sending districts, the programs we will deliver not only today but in the future. That planner is going to come up with a state master price agreement bid process. A state bid opened at the beginning of

September and it is now December 14th and there is no bid award by the state for that work. We will be piggybacking on that state contract to get our Educational Facility Planner. It has dragged on for months. Even when it is awarded, RIDE is going to have some say in which school they want that planner to go to first. Once we do have an award, we will be doing some begging and pleading to RIDE to get us at the top of their priority list. It's the bid process. It took us months to get the Master Planner Coordinator, but it is typically across all state agencies. Even Scott Jensen, Director of DLT, made a plea for us at State Purchasing to see if they would push through bids for us regarding our Machine Tech Program. He was basically told that because of state purchasing laws, no one's bids are fast-tracked. So he tried.

6) Other

The Commissioner's visit has been rescheduled to January 28th, at 12:30. Mr. Burns asked about topics for discussion. V. Gailliard-Garrick's top priority would be the Funding Formula. A second one would be the support of expansion of this building and getting it up to par.

A couple years ago Deborah Gist came in and the students presented in the Patriot Room. Will it be the same set up as that? "No," the Commissioner wants to come in and tour the programs and then sit down with some leadership people. As he tours some of the programs, some of our SkillsUSA students will be interacting with him.

How large of an expansion are we recommending to do? For the older part of the building, we are looking for some cosmetic changes, some structural changes that will come out of the Educational Planner's review and findings. Then there is the Modular Building. That has to come down; it is 20 plus years old and it outlived its life. We are getting almost \$10,000 to have mold removed during the holiday break. We need a new building. V. Gailliard-Garrick would like a building that will house the Bio-technology Manufacturing and Health Careers programs, a Health and Science Building.

Mr. Burns added, maybe it is too aspirational, but wouldn't you think the CTE folks would start to rationalize programs and decide what we, as a state, are not producing and then find a home for those that are producing. At their last meeting, they just finished up looking at three areas that are on the list of emerging industries: Health Careers, Manufacturing, and Construction. Health Careers sub-committee that V. Gailliard-Garrick sat on, submitted 7 programs that the Board approved and now it has to go to RIDE. They are CNA, Patient Care Technician, Dental Hygienist, Medical Interpreter, Pharmacy Technician. So there may ways for us to expand? "Yes," but we need the space. Right now we have the Patient Care Technician, the CNA, and CVS Pharmacy Program. We have 3 of the 7 that are already here, but if we want to expand that, we don't have the space. The master plan will include what the CTE is working towards? "Yes."

The Manufacturing sub-committee work will be finalized in February. V. Gailliard-Garrick has been working on some stuff with Bill McCourt. The Construction sub-committee will be reporting out at the next CTE board meeting in December. Then the next two areas the board will be looking at will be IT and Business Finance. She doesn't know what the third area is yet. Mr. Manning mentioned maybe Defense, but Mrs. Smith thinks it is Cyber-security. The Commissioner is big on IT. It is moving. Mr. Burns just wants to make sure the work being done by the Building Committee is in sync with the work that is being done by the CTE Board. V. Gailliard-Garrick ensured him that it will.

IV. Adjournment -

At 5:48 p.m., Mrs. Kyle asked for a motion to adjourn; all were in favor.