

REGULAR MEETING OF THE FALL RIVER SCHOOL COMMITTEE

Monday, September 14, 2015

5:30 PM

Morton Middle School
1135 North Main Street
Fall River, MA 02720

AGENDA

1. Roll Call
2. Salute to the Flag
3. Citizens Input
4. Subcommittee Reports
5. Recognition Awards
6. Superintendent's Report
7. Approval of Minutes
8. Committee of the Whole
9. Request for Executive Session
M.G.L. c30A Section 21 (a) (2) and (3)
 - *To conduct strategy sessions in preparation for all litigation or grievances, as well as negotiations with custodians, paraprofessionals, clerical, FREA, FRAA, and non-union personnel including Ms. Kelley Mahoney, Athletic Trainer; Mr. Evan Massoud, FRED-TV; Ms. Jessica Rodriguez, Family Support Specialist; Ms. Donna Cabral, Transportation Coordinator; Ms. Amanda Medeiros, Behavior Therapist; Ms. Ashley Estacio, Behavior Therapist; Ms. Paula M. Soares, Administrative Assistant; Ms. Rochelle Pettenati, Administrative Intern; Mr. Robert Hargraves, Administrative Intern; and Ms. Meg Mayo-Brown, Superintendent of Schools.*
10. New Business: Topics for discussion that could not reasonably be anticipated by the Chairman forty-eight (48) hours prior to the meeting
11. Addendum

**Minutes of the Regular Meeting of the Fall River School Committee
September 14, 2015**

At 5:38 PM Mayor Sutter read the Open Meeting Law.

Mayor Sutter then asked for a roll call for attendance which showed Mr. Andrade, Mr. Costa, Mr. Hart, Mr. Martins, Mr. Maynard, Mrs. Panchley and Mayor Sutter were present. Attorney Assad and Superintendent Mayo-Brown were also present.

A salute to the Flag followed.

Citizens' Input

No citizen signed up to speak this evening.

Subcommittee Reports

There were no subcommittee reports this evening.

Recognition Awards

Mr. Martins read the testimonial submitted by Deb Faris which explained the late Mr. William Napert's devotion to getting school uniforms implemented at Talbot Middle School which was then followed by other schools across the district. The School Committee along with Ms. Faris presented the award to Mrs. Napert. Mr. Napert's daughters and granddaughters were also present.

Superintendent's Report

1. Madame Superintendent was pleased to announce that they opened school last week by welcoming close to 1,000 educators at their educators' conference on Tuesday. She encouraged all to watch the sing-a-long posted on the district's website. It was a great event and got the year started in a very positive fashion.
2. Wednesday they welcomed more than 10,000 students to Fall River Public Schools and kindergarten screening has been ongoing since that time. Kindergarten opens this upcoming Wednesday.

Mayor Sutter asked the total number of students that reported for class on Wednesday.

Madame Superintendent believed they had approximately 96% attendance across the district.

Minutes

Mayor Sutter said the next item was the approval of minutes.

MOTION: Mr. Andrade – Mr. Martins: To approve the minutes.

No Discussion

All were in favor

None were opposed

Motion passed

Travel Requests

MOTION: Mr. Maynard – Mr. Andrade: To approve all travel.

No Discussion

All were in favor

None were opposed

Motion passed

Donations

MOTION: Mr. Maynard – Mrs. Panchley: To accept all donations.

No discussion

All were in favor

None were opposed

Motion passed

Contracts

MOTION: Mr. Andrade – Mr. Hart: To move approval of all contracts.

Discussion

Mr. Martins referred to the contract for Southcoast Hospitals Group for the Employee Assistance Program at a cost of \$32,200 and said while he believed in the program if an employee is running into difficulty; he wondered how many staff took advantage of these services during the last school year.

Superintendent Mayo-Brown said she was happy to get that information out to the School Committee as she didn't have it with her that evening.

Mr. Martins said he just needed numbers and not names. The contracted cost was the same whether they had one person or zero using the services.

Superintendent Mayo-Brown said that was correct noting they would not be able to provide names due to confidentiality and privacy rights of employees but they could provide them with the numbers of employees that accessed the program.

Mr. Martins thought if it was zero or one it may be more economically feasible to simply pay for the treatment versus a retaining fee of \$32,000.

Madame Superintendent understood and assured him it was more than one. She would get back to him with the specific number.

Mr. Martins said he hoped there was not more than one because it means people are having difficulties that require professional help but if they do they certainly need the benefit of such a program. It is determining if it is worthy of a retainer or an individual payment.

Mrs. Panchley asked Madame Superintendent about the School and Main Institute contract noting they had discussed it in the spring and had made an allocation in FY15 toward the Parent Academy. She wondered what the additional money would be for.

Superintendent Mayo-Brown explained that they started the Parent Academy planning mid-year. It was an 18 month plan from assessing what is available in the community, determining what parents' needs are throughout the community, and then creating the academies with the community. The first contract was for \$40,000 which was covered in FY15 and this is the remainder of it. After FY16 she does not anticipate coming forward again because the intent of the academy is for them to be sustained through and with the community.

Mrs. Panchley asked if she expected this to be an allotment through June 30th and then will be self-sustaining after that.

Superintendent Mayo-Brown said that was the plan.

All were in favor	None were opposed	Motion passed
--------------------------	--------------------------	----------------------

Grants

Mr. Martins said he would like to hold on the first, second, and fourth grants. He felt that there is usually a motion to approve all grants and it doesn't give an opportunity to segregate grants out that should not be approved.

MOTION: Mr. Martins– Mr. Costa: That the grants be taken singularly rather than as a group.

No discussion

All were in favor	None were opposed	Motion passed
--------------------------	--------------------------	----------------------

Mayor Sutter said they would start with the first grant, Title I.

MOTION: Mrs. Panchley – Mr. Hart: To approve the Title I grant.

Discussion

Mr. Martins said in the second block it says Instructional Coaches and he thought they were getting rid of those positions. He asked if these were new or existing coaches.

Superintendent Mayo-Brown said they are existing coaches that have been in the budget. She thought he may be referring to at times principals coming forward and requesting a conversion of a coach. When that occurs, the Committee typically eliminates the coaching position if that is the request. There are some schools that have coaches as well as department heads. None of the seven instructional coaches that are represented in the budget are new to the Committee.

Mr. Martins asked if she was stating that because the Committee did not use the words “we remove funding for the coach” that that coach position is still funded.

Madame Superintendent said it is only eliminated when they use the terminology “conversion” but there are schools in the district such as Henry Lord that have a department head as well as a coach. Schools present their budgets to the Committee during finance subcommittee during the budget building process and sometimes they are requesting a new FTE for a department head and sometimes they are requesting a conversion. When it is a conversion, they do not back fill the coaching position because that is a conversion of the FTE. If it is a new FTE then that is a new FTE to the budget.

Mr. Martins said it was always his understanding that if they wanted the department head in place of a coach then they give up the coach to get that. The department head costs a little bit more money to do basically the same thing but can also evaluate. From now on he will make it a point to state as a motion that that position is no longer available/funded.

Mr. Martins continued that his second issue is the \$1,000,000 for planning and evaluation as a primary function. He asked Madame Superintendent if it took 13 full-time administrators for planning and evaluation of curriculum.

Regular Meeting of the Fall River School Committee – Monday, September 14, 2015

Superintendent Mayo-Brown said if Mr. Martins had specific questions around position allocations and what the individuals do within the school system then she would ask through the Chair that their Title I Director, Siohban Ryan, come up and explain those to him.

Mr. Martins agreed and Mayor Sutter asked that Ms. Ryan come forward.

Mr. Martins asked about the administrative salaries.

Ms. Ryan said it makes up the instructional leaders that are in schools across the district. In the drop down menu they are given from the Department of Education, planning and evaluation best describes their role in each building. They basically oversee the instruction in the building, the planning of it, and the evaluation of teachers.

Mr. Martins said at that rate those 13 people are \$79,080 each provided they are on the same step.

Superintendent Mayo-Brown asked Ms. Ryan to give Mr. Martins an example.

Ms. Ryan said these positions are Deans of Teaching of Learning and Department Heads. There wasn't enough space in the workbook to describe each title.

Mr. Martins asked for what subject material.

Ms. Ryan responded ELA or math.

Mr. Martins asked if that school had a department head for ELA.

Ms. Ryan responded yes.

Mr. Martins said that would mean they now have two department heads.

Superintendent Mayo-Brown responded no and explained it was a matter of funding. A school will have a department head funded either through the operating budget or through Title I. These represent the 13 administrators in schools that are funded through Title I. Not all administrators are funded through the operating budget.

Mr. Martins moved on to block six and asked about consultants for professional development at \$1,000 per day for a total amount of \$218,662. He wondered how many consultants that amount of money would be for.

Ms. Ryan said in the Finance Subcommittee meeting it was discussed that they would create placeholders for Title I until they decided what to do with some of the allocation. It was put in as a placeholder and teacher stipends were as well.

Mr. Martins said when he looks at this he sees \$1,000 per day/\$218,000. That is one person for 218 days.

Ms. Ryan said it does not mean it is for the same person; it could be different consultants coming in to do different work in different buildings.

Regular Meeting of the Fall River School Committee – Monday, September 14, 2015

Superintendent Mayo-Brown explained again that the funds are not identified for any consultants. Ms. Ryan had to put a placeholder in for the additional Title I funds until the School Committee determines how to reduce class size. They had to set the funds aside somewhere in the budget.

Mr. Martins said he would highly suggest to Madame Superintendent that the administrators get reduced and the amount of money that it is reduced by be put into block two for additional teachers. He believes in professional development (PD) but questioned how much money they have expended on PD and if they were getting their money's worth. From what he sees as far as the results in the change of student learning, he has to question the amount of money that is being expended on PD versus having a good portion of that money put into teaching. He was glad that somewhere inside the material it made reference to having faculty input as to what they feel is best for additional learning to be able to cope with the differences of students within a classroom.

Superintendent Mayo-Brown said for clarification purposes he is referencing a line item that is also a placeholder for the Committee to determine how to best use those funds in order to make an impact on student learning.

Mr. Martins said he is not all that happy about placeholders.

Superintendent Mayo-Brown said she is not either but as they explained in Finance Subcommittee a few weeks ago, they had to submit the Title I grant in order to ensure that the funds were received in the district to make payroll for the individuals who have been budgeted in Title I for a number of years. Their two choices were to submit the grant with placeholders or not submit it and not make the payroll for grant employees.

Mr. Martins thought they had this discussion before regarding grants coming to them after they are already approved by the Department of Education.

Superintendent Mayo-Brown said as it was explained at the Finance Subcommittee meeting; they needed to submit it in order to meet payroll. She felt there was agreement at the subcommittee level that they would submit an amendment once the Committee made a determination on how to use the additional \$1.3M to impact student learning.

Mr. Martins felt it equated to "just say yes, it's a done deal" and he thought they had come to an agreement that that was not going to be taking place unless an absolute emergency and that the grants would come forward for a vote of the Committee and then move on. He thought this grant came out sometime in April.

Superintendent Mayo-Brown responded no and Ms. Ryan explained the funds were made available at the end of July and they were able to apply in August.

Mr. Martins asked when they were first notified they were going to be getting the money.

Ms. Ryan responded mid-July.

Mr. Martins said he yielded on this grant.

Mrs. Panchley said she wanted to clarify some items they discussed at the August Finance Subcommittee meeting that Mr. Martins attended. The 13 administrators were in the FY16 budget that the School Committee approved and when they go through each school and their positions they

know how they are funded and it is laid out by school. When they approve that budget it is clear to the Committee which administrative positions are being funded by Title I. She did not see an issue on that because they were all well aware of that in the spring.

She continued that block 6 and the \$218,000; it was spoken about at Finance Subcommittee meeting because the \$1.3M allocation came down in July they all expressed an interest at that meeting about how to reduce classroom sizes with that money but as the Superintendent explained, they needed to submit the grant to meet payroll. Everyone in the room at that time knew they wanted to use that money to reduce adult to student ratios and the Superintendent would come back with recommendations after hearing from teachers on how they wanted to reduce those ratios. It may vary by school but they discussed interventionists, paraprofessionals, and co-teaching models as they don't have any classrooms to open up to put more teachers and students into. It was the intention of the Finance Subcommittee that they would meet once the Superintendent gathered data on how teachers best thought they could meet students' needs. It was never the intention that that money be put into contractual services. She wanted to make that clear because she did not want the community watching thinking they are throwing that money into contractual services that they had not decided upon. It was very clear at the subcommittee meeting that the will was to reduce classroom size with that money and that is still her intention.

Mr. Andrade felt the good thing about Mr. Martins having questions on this item is that they got an excellent explanation as to what the placeholders were. Just looking at it quickly they might not have known. He also remembered that in regard to the 13 administrative positions when they did look at the budget he did see that almost every school had at least one grant funded position. The explanation made it clear and he thanked Ms. Ryan.

Mr. Martins said while what Mrs. Panchley stated is partially accurate in that when they are going through the budget it references grant funding in specific places; they, unfortunately, do not go through the grant budget as scrupulously as they go through the regular budget. He will not base his vote on what the opinion of any subcommittee is. He wants to know and he will continue to ask. If it is not clear, he will not vote for it.

Mrs. Panchley responded that she was not suggesting anyone take a vote based on the Finance Subcommittee; what she was suggesting is that when they get the budget book, every school details every position that they are requesting and what the funding is from. She was stating that those 13 positions were allocated through schools and said they were going to be paid by Title I funds. In her opinion, when she approved that budget, she approved those administrative positions being paid by the Title I grant.

All were in favor	None were opposed	Motion passed
--------------------------	--------------------------	----------------------

MOTION: Mr. Costa – Mr. Andrade: To approve the Title IIA grant.

Discussion

Mr. Andrade said that Title IIA did not seem to be as clear as Title I and he questioned if these were part-time positions after school and summer.

Superintendent Mayo-Brown explained that Title IIA is slightly different than Title I. The federal requirements around Title IIA target the grant toward professional development and building the instructional capacity of teachers as well as administrators.

Regular Meeting of the Fall River School Committee – Monday, September 14, 2015

Ms. Ryan further explained that in the administrative salaries, the first salary is just a portion of a salary. It is a district level salary that oversees professional development for the district. The supervisor/director in the second row is school based. The instructional coaches are school based as well.

Superintendent Mayo-Brown noted that the partial FTE they see for grant program/manager/coordinator actually funds 50% of the Financial Manager position.

Mr. Martins asked why they needed a supervisor/director for .3 FTE and then a program manager for a .5 FTE and a supervisor/director for 2 FTEs.

Superintendent Mayo-Brown responded that for the first supervisor/director, the grant pays for 30% of that individual's salary. It is a full-time position and the funding for that full-time position is spread across a variety of sources. Title IIA picks up 30% of that full-time salary.

Mr. Martins asked if it was to administer that grant.

Superintendent Mayo-Brown said no; they are able to say that the Director of Professional Development position focuses on professional development as described in the grant; therefore, they can justify this grant paying 30% of her salary.

Mr. Martins said it goes on to having a grant manager/coordinator for .5 FTE.

Superintendent Mayo-Brown explained that is also a full-time position (Financial Manager) in the district and this grant pays for 50% of that full-time salary. The supervisor/directors are school based positions that the grant pays for.

Mr. Martins responded that it was pretty lucrative pay when they are looking at two people at \$193,000.

Superintendent Mayo Brown responded that they pay their administrators based on the collective bargaining agreement between the School Committee and the Fall River Administrators' Association.

Mr. Martins said he understood that but thought it seemed to be heavy in the administration portion of the Title II grant.

Ms. Ryan explained that Title IIA cannot be used to pay for teaching salaries and can only be used for administrators or coaches that are working on improving teacher quality.

Mr. Martins asked if there were coaches in the grant.

Ms. Ryan responded that there were coaches in the budget as well.

Mr. Martins questioned how many administrators they needed to administer the Title IIA program.

Superintendent Mayo-Brown said it is not administering the program; this money is funding positions in a school. In terms of coaches, part of their role is providing professional development and since it is, they can pay for their salaries out of this grant rather than the operating budget.

Regular Meeting of the Fall River School Committee – Monday, September 14, 2015

Ms. Ryan also noted that some of their schools are not Title I schools so they support the positions in those schools similar to the ones that are in Title I budget with Title IIA funds.

Mr. Martins asked if it was an after school program issue.

Ms. Ryan and Madame Superintendent both responded no.

Mr. Martins noted that it said there is a number to be determined but at \$30 per hour.

Ms. Ryan explained that was for teachers who attend professional development.

Superintendent Mayo-Brown said they may be attending professional development or they may have teachers who are working on committees that they will identify as professional development because they may be developing curriculum together. They are eligible to receive stipends for that work and that stipend money reflects what goes to them.

Mr. Martins asked if Title II was for math.

Ms. Ryan responded no, it was for teacher quality.

Mr. Costa thanked Ms. Ryan for her explanation and explained that Title IIA has been around for some time and just like the other grants; they are federal funds that assist the district in providing needed services. Without the funds the district is left with some choices about where to fund it and they are limited. If the grants did not pick up portions of the salaries, the services would not be delivered or the Committee could go on record and take money out of the operating budget which would then cause that budget to become exhausted or further taxed in terms of the services they could provide through the operating budget. This is not something new and the district has been utilizing Title grants to supplement the services they provide students in some of their most needy schools for years. Each grant has a specific requirement that is laid out by the grant application and the uses are very specific. The grants are reviewed and audited and if they were somehow non-compliant with the use of the grants they would jeopardize further funding and that is why they have Ms. Ryan to manage the grants and bring forward recommendations to the Committee. He continued that he did not have a problem with paying a percentage of someone's salary from this particular grant if it qualifies for that use. Without this funding, they would be having a conversation about how they would provide the services that these individuals are providing for their students. They have profound needs in the district and he thought the grants are intended to serve that purpose and that they do a good job utilizing the funds to do so.

Mr. Costa thanked Ms. Ryan again for her explanations on the two grants noting that the grants come before them and the positions are not surprises to them. They are laid out in their overall budget where the funding is going to come from and are noted in the budget binder. Unfortunately, they come at a later date but the discussion about where the positions are going to be funded are a conversation that they have that usually starts sometime in February and goes right through the beginning of the fiscal year. He is content with the presentation and if anyone viewing the meeting has any questions regarding the application, he is sure they can be made available to them but he has no issues voting in supporting not only this grant but the other grants presented this evening.

Mr. Andrade said he is glad they had this discussion because it really clarified a number of items they might not have been that knowledgeable about in terms of how grant funds are used. It also clarifies it for anyone watching the meeting. He knows at one time grant funded programs were often separate

and apart from the regular school program and it came about to take care of certain problems as perceived on the federal or state level and now what it appears that those programs that were separate are now very much a part of the regular school system. There is still intent as to how those funds should be used but now they are split up and infused into the regular school system. He agreed with what Mr. Costa said and thanked Ms. Ryan for her explanation.

Mr. Martins said he understood but questioned how they could provide additional teachers and where the money was coming from. He stated that Title I and Title II could be used to hire teachers and that they could also hire teachers with Race to the Top funds. This particular grant is \$870,000 and when he looks through it, \$193,000 is used for administrative salaries and \$356,000 is used for coaches' salaries. He questioned how much was used for teachers to have additional teaching going on either in smaller classes or through joint co-teaching. If they cannot find the room, he did not see anything wrong with having two teachers to give the students twice the amount of attention that they need. The only thing that he sees for teachers is stipends at \$30 per hour for \$29,700 which isn't much compared to the overall grant amount. He noted disapprovingly that this is another grant that is already approved by DESE.

Superintendent Mayo-Brown said to Ms. Ryan that it has been a while since she administered the Title IIA grant and asked if they could hire classroom teachers of record for the grant.

Ms. Ryan said Fall River has never used the funds to reduce class size; they have always used the funds to develop teacher quality. There have been no changes in the expenditures or lines in these grants since she has been there.

Superintendent Mayo-Brown said for the public information, the positions that are in the grant go through the budget process throughout the spring as part of the overall budget that the Committee adopted so, therefore, they submit the grant based on the Committee's approval of the school department budget and then present them to the Committee. If the Committee wishes to make modifications to the grant to point funds in a different direction that is their prerogative and she is happy to have that conversation if they want to eliminate positions and hire more classroom teachers. She encouraged them to have that conversation during the budget process rather than when school begins.

Mr. Maynard said he went through the report and thought the Committee did a good job on it. He thought they spend the money in the right places. He was amazed when he got to class sizes because it is the biggest issue in the school system and he would like to see them lowered. He thought they did a great job on it and congratulated them.

Mr. Costa said just for the record, the Title I budget includes 16 instructional teachers to provide individual instruction to their students at \$937,000 and if he understood correctly, section 6 which also has about \$245,000 is also a placeholder for the Superintendent to come back to the Committee with recommendations regarding the possibility of reducing class size. There is a little over \$1.1M in the first grant they approved for teachers. There is just as much money in Title I for teachers as there are for administrators. He felt as though there was an equal balance noting that Title IIA does not allot for the hiring of classroom teachers and is more to develop the teachers they have and provide opportunities. The funds are set aside to hopefully accomplish that.

A roll call showed:

Mr. Andrade: Yes	Mr. Maynard: Yes
Mr. Costa: Yes	Mrs. Panchley: Yes
Mr. Hart: Yes	Mayor Sutter: Yes
Mr. Martins: Abstained	

6 were in favor None were opposed 1 abstained (Mr. Martins) Motion passed

MOTION: Mr. Costa – Mr. Hart: To approve the McKinney-Vento homeless grant.

No discussion

All were in favor None were opposed Motion passed

MOTION: Mr. Hart – Mr. Costa: To approve the Implementation-Expanded Learning Time grant.

Discussion

Mr. Martins asked what school this grant was for and what position the supervisor/director at \$30,000 held.

Madame Superintendent said these are the grant funded ELT schools of Kuss, Viveiros, and Silvia. This is a state line item in the budget that funds the grant. It funds twelve staff. She realizes that may be slightly confusing because of the way they have to calculate it for DESE. As they are aware, the ELT grant is covered in their collective bargaining agreements (CBA) both for FREA and FRAA and they receive additional compensation for the sake of working at an ELT school. They are seeing contractual stipends.

Mr. Martins asked in the first one if the principal gets his or her regular salary plus \$30,000.

Superintendent Mayo-Brown responded no, the FRAA collective bargaining agreement captures language that FRAA members could receive \$7,500 per member or if the grant funding is not adequate to cover that that stipend drops down to \$4,000 per FRAA administrator.

Mr. Martins said what was negotiated is that the first person gets an additional \$30,000, the second \$42,000, and the next \$30,000.

Superintendent Mayo-Brown responded no, and explained that it is all of the combined administrators at a particular school. It is not one single administrator getting that stipend. Those amounts represent a number of stipends – the total of the relevant stipends per school.

Mr. Martins asked the total number of hours in a school year that the ELT operates.

Superintendent Mayo-Brown said it is over 300 hours.

Mr. Martins asked if that was average of all schools.

Superintendent Mayo-Brown said it is average at the ELT schools (Kuss, Viveiros and Silvia).

Mr. Martins said that was \$100 an hour and yielded.

Mrs. Panchley expressed how fortunate she felt that the state has selected three of their schools to provide this money for ELT. Both of her children attended Silvia School and at graduation last year, Mrs. Facchiano said that students that go from K-5 at Silvia actually have 2 extra years of school. This

Regular Meeting of the Fall River School Committee – Monday, September 14, 2015

is state money that is additional to their budget. She believed there were 20-22 schools in the state that receive this money and they have three of them. She also noted that all three of those schools are level one schools. They are lucky as a district that the state has invested that money.

Superintendent Mayo-Brown asked Mr. Martins how he arrived at the figure of administrators receiving \$100 per hour.

Mr. Martins said \$30,000 at 300 hours is \$100 per hour.

Superintendent Mayo-Brown explained that is divided by 5-6 administrators. The \$30,000 he is looking at represents a combination of stipends. She does not want the public to think they are paying their administrators \$100 per hour.

Mr. Martins asked her for the page number.

Superintendent Mayo-Brown said she is looking at the *ELT School Budget Summary*.

They had further discussion on where Mr. Martins could find the information Superintendent Mayo-Brown was describing.

Mr. Martins thought it would be nice to have it spelled out as to how many people it represents. He felt it was reasonable to conclude that it was one person for the amount of money indicated.

All were in favor	None were opposed	Motion passed
--------------------------	--------------------------	----------------------

Discussion Items

1. Vote to Approve: Massachusetts School Building Authority’s design enrollment recommendation

MOTION: Mr. Costa – Mr. Hart: To approve the Massachusetts School Building Authority’s design enrollment recommendation.

No discussion

All were in favor	None were opposed	Motion passed
--------------------------	--------------------------	----------------------

2. Vote to Approve: School Committee procedural request of City Council to appropriate funding for B.M.C. Durfee High School feasibility study

MOTION: Mr. Costa – Mr. Hart: To approve the procedural request of the City Council to appropriate funding for the B.M.C. Durfee High School feasibility study.

Discussion

Mrs. Panchley thought they needed to read the motion as it was presented in their binder.

Mayor Sutter thought that was a good idea.

Mrs. Panchley asked if Mr. Costa wanted to amend his motion.

AMENDED MOTION: Mr. Costa – Mr. Hart: To approve the procedural request of the City Council to appropriate funding for the B.M.C. Durfee High School feasibility study as outlined by Mr. Coogan for the Committee.

Discussion

Mayor Sutter asked Mr. Costa to repeat what he said.

Mr. Costa said he would read it for the record:

NEW AMENDED MOTION: Mr. Costa – Mr. Hart: That the City appropriate the amount of One Million (\$1,000,000.00) Dollars for the purpose of paying costs of the Feasibility Study for the Durfee High School Project, located at 360 Elsbree Street, Fall River, MA, including the payment of all costs incidental or related thereto, and for which the City of Fall River may be eligible for a grant from the Massachusetts School Building Authority (also known as the “MSBA”), said amount to be expended under the direction of The Durfee High School Project Building Committee. To meet this appropriation the Fall River City Council, with the approval of the Mayor is authorized to borrow said amount under and pursuant to M.G.L. Chapter 44, or pursuant to any other enabling authority. The City of Fall River acknowledges that the MSBA’s grant program is non-entitlement, discretionary program based on need, as determined by the MSBA, and any costs the city incurs in excess of any grant approved by and received from the MSBA shall be the sole responsibility of the city.

Discussion

Mr. Andrade thought there was no doubt that the feasibility study is a requirement for the process but wondered exactly what the study would include.

Superintendent Mayo-Brown asked through the Chair to have Mr. Coogan come up and describe the process and what is included in the feasibility study.

Mr. Coogan explained that the feasibility study is a process that is designed to run 270 days or less and that process is for the MSBA - in conjunction with the city - to evaluate options for a new high school building project. At the end of that process, the city would then receive a recommendation in the form of a report of what the scope, cost, and design of that building might look like as well as their recommendations to precede. The cost of the study is estimated at a little over \$900K which is where the \$1M figure comes from and that cost is 80% reimbursable by the MSBA. The city would carry roughly 20% of whatever the final cost for the report is.

Mayor Sutter thought it seemed like a lot of money for a feasibility study and asked if Mr. Coogan could break that down a little bit for them. He thought it was hard to conceive that enterprises would be spending \$1M for a feasibility study for things such as a new football stadium. He was curious as to why it was so expensive for the study of a high school.

Mr. Coogan explained that the figure includes architectural fees, design fees, looking at the overall process and scope of the project, any testing that might need to be done on the site, the design of the site, traffic studies and any impact it might have on the surrounding community - all the things that fold into the city’s scope and cost of the project. He thought the estimate they received was in conjunction with the MSBA who is quite skilled in building these projects and the amount was somewhere between \$900,000 and \$1,000,000. While this is a placeholder, he believed it was designed to encompass all those potential costs the city would be looking at in order to scope the project.

Mayor Sutter wondered if Mr. Coogan had any memory of the cost of the feasibility study for the Morton Middle School.

Mr. Coogan said no and explained that project was on the board for quite a while before they entered into the construction project and he was not there for the beginning of that project which was ten years or more ago.

Mayor Sutter asked if he knew about the new high school in Somerset and Mr. Coogan did not have that number.

Mayor Sutter said he is just asking if it is generally the ball park or if the configuration of the current Durfee High School and the land and topography is such that it is going to be a more costly study.

Mr. Coogan believed in the scope of the MSBA's literature some cases they cited over \$2M for similar sized high schools. He thought there was a list of 8-10 different communities and the fees ranged from less than \$1M and in many cases for the high schools or larger scale projects, they were between \$1M and \$2M. He thought in this particular case, as they have potentially located a site and they switched to a prototype design where they work off an existing already developed set of project plans, he believed that cut some of the costs down. Although the \$1M is a lot of money and the public has a right to question that, it is less than it could be based on some projects.

Mayor Sutter thanked Mr. Coogan for that explanation.

Mrs. Panchley clarified for the public that they are asking the city to appropriate \$1M and it is estimated that it could be about \$900,000. It is a sure thing that the MSBA will cover 80% of that cost. It sounds like the city would need to appropriate the \$1M and whatever does not get spent would go to pay the bond if that is how it is funded and then the 80% would come down from the state to pay off the loan. In the end the city will not be paying \$1M but 20% of what the study costs.

Mr. Coogan explained that essentially the city creates a pot of money and it is put into reserve. The fees are then paid and then the MSBA reimburses through that project and then any of the reimbursement retires and they are left with the net amount which would be \$200,000 or less in this case.

Mrs. Panchley agreed and said she did not want to make light of that amount of money but she did want to make it clear to the public that the state would be reimbursing a large portion of that money.

Mayor Sutter asked if for some reason the funding for the new high school does not happen, if the 20% is lost.

Mr. Coogan said yes; it is the cost for the study to develop.

Mayor Sutter thought that was a serious issue.

Mr. Costa thought without the feasibility study they would be flying blind. They would be building a school not knowing what the total cost would be and if they are ever going to be able to gain voter confidence and ask the citizens of the city to step up and make a commitment to build a school. They have to do a thorough feasibility study so they can come back with an accurate total amount they are going to look to spend as a community for the high school. He clearly understands if they go through this process and the study comes back and suggests the cost is going to be too great for the city to endure then the money they spent on the feasibility study is gone but he thought it would be money well spent because if not, they do

not know what the total costs would be for this project and whether or not they as a community are interested in making that investment.

Mr. Coogan said again that part of that feasibility study is the assessment of the current conditions at the school as well as the site and a future building possibility of the school. They are going to get the entire project evaluated and they will have some concrete information about what the options are for proceeding with the project. It proceeds in phases and the feasibility study is one portion of the project. If they elect not to go forward with the rest of the project that amount is still eligible for the 80%.

Mr. Maynard asked if Mr. Coogan knew if the state ever refused to build a school after the feasibility study.

Mr. Coogan said it is his understanding that there are a number of communities either through their own desire or after the feasibility study revealed issues that have pulled out of the process but it is a joint process and not just the state refusing to do it. Usually when they have gotten to this process there have been assessments along the way that indicate eligibility and they are in the eligibility phase right now.

Mr. Maynard asked if he knew if the state ever refused to put up the money to build a new school.

Mr. Coogan said they have had some placeholders and preliminary discussions around what the costs might look like but thought if the feasibility study revealed that those costs were considerably higher or not practical for either the city or the state then there is always a possibility that that could happen but the study would give more concrete information to be able to make that kind of a decision whether it be on the city's part or on the part of the state.

Mr. Martins thought a feasibility study was a matter of course and they have to go through environmental issues, etc. He does not know of any school building that after committing to a feasibility study that the school was not built and that money was lost. He knows it is a lot of money but at 80% paid by the state, felt it was a good deal.

Mr. Costa said for a point of information, the money that is used to build the new schools actually comes from the tax that is put on individuals that smoke cigarettes. He asked Mr. Coogan if that was correct.

Mr. Coogan said a portion may be. When the MSBA was retooled several years back and the sales tax went from 5% to 6.25%, that additional bump in the sales tax was designed to create a fund which funds the MSBA.

Mr. Costa said that was correct and yielded.

Mr. Martins said if it gets approved there is a signature page for the Mayor, Superintendent, and a dually authorized representative of the School Committee. Mr. Martins asked who would sign the School Committee line.

Superintendent Mayo-Brown said for clarification Mr. Martins is referring to the Design Enrollment Certification that was agenda item one.

Mr. Martins said that was correct. There are three signatures required and he questioned who would sign the third line.

Mayor Sutter proposed the Vice-Chair because he would be signing as Mayor. He felt the dually authorized representative should be next in line assuming Mr. Costa would like to do that.

Mr. Costa agreed to sign the document noting he was present at the meeting in Boston that was had just a few weeks ago. He is familiar with what went into coming up with the design enrollment and does not have any hesitation in signing.

Mayor Sutter thanked Vice-Chair Costa.

There was no further discussion.

A roll call showed:

Mr. Andrade: Yes	Mr. Maynard: Yes
Mr. Costa: Yes	Mrs. Panchley: Yes
Mr. Hart: Yes	Mayor Sutter: Yes
Mr. Martins: Yes	

All were in favor	None were opposed	Motion passed
-------------------	-------------------	---------------

3. Discussion and Vote to Approve: The application to the Community Preservation Association (CPA) for the preservation of the historic Mann murals

MOTION: Mr. Andrade – Mr. Hart: To approve the application to the Community Preservation Association (CPA) for the preservation of the historic Mann murals.

Discussion

Mr. Andrade thought this was a very positive issue and is not only a question of protecting excellent art work but also a question of protecting some of the recording of Fall River history. He thought it would be a shame to let that be destroyed over time. Too often in the past they have allowed historic buildings and artifacts to be destroyed. He feels it is important to keep that in good condition.

Mr. Costa asked that they extend through the Chair an opportunity for Ms. Rodrigues to address the Committee if she'd like to. She and Mr. Camara were instrumental in bringing this to the subcommittee's attention and he appreciates the work that she has put in. He thought it would be very worthwhile to ask that the city consider the CPA funding for a project like this because it does have a great historical value right here in the city that many people may not be aware of.

Mayor Sutter asked that Ms. Rodrigues address the Committee.

Ms. Joyce Rodrigues said she did indeed stumble into this and gave a detailed history of the murals and what has transpired over the past several weeks. She noted that there are 21 panels and in her research she found out that Fall River has the largest extent of WPA murals in the United States. They are on canvas which is a plus when they think about restoring them and keeping them safe. Ms. Rodrigues also thought this was a great resource for the city as far as tourism was concerned.

Ms. Rodrigues continued by explaining some of the roof damage at the Resiliency Preparatory School where the murals are housed. What they identified and put into the application to the Community Preservation Act (CPA) monies was replacing the roof as an immediate issue. Mr. Coogan is dealing with emergency repairs. All they can do at this point is address that and buy time for the School Committee and city to decide what they are going to do with the technical building. It gives them time to think it through and get ahead of the problem. Ms. Rodrigues gave some history of the old technical building noting it was built the first time in 1911, in 1917 it was a hospital for the city during the influenza epidemic, in 1927 it burned to the ground, it was rebuilt and opened in 1930. Entering WWII

it was a site for defense training for men and women who were working in defense industries in Fall River and it continues today to be the Resiliency School.

Ms. Rodrigues concluded by saying that she supports protecting what she knows is a significant collection in Fall River and the United States. She knows the state of Massachusetts will support them when they go forward with this and ask for any additional funding that is available for historic preservation. She and her colleagues now own this and with the help of the CPA and the School Committee they will move forward to help keep this collection stable for the time being until they can figure out what to do in the future.

Mayor Sutter thanked Ms. Rodrigues for her passion and commitment to this.

Mr. Hart thanked Ms. Rodrigues for being present. He thought their first meeting was very productive. Her group came in with a lot of pictures and issues of what they thought was wrong with the building and the roof and with the cooperation of Mr. Coogan they will hopefully resolve that soon before the winter and snow. It is something he is looking forward to working with her on and would like to keep in touch.

Ms. Rodrigues said she will keep them apprised of how this develops through the CPA. She thinks they are all sitting on the worst case scenario. They know what happened to the Coughlin School and that buildings burn or fall down and does not want to wait for that to happen. This is one of the times they can get out there and ahead of themselves without waiting for the disaster to happen. They own it now and they need to realize this is their legacy for the future. She knows that the School Committee's intent is for the future of their children and the city and all its history that is why she and Mr. Camara are going to move this forward. The preliminary deadline was September 1 on the proposal and the final deadline is February 1 so they will have a definite plan in place by February of 2016.

Mr. Martins thanked Ms. Rodrigues for her presentation and said the murals are certainly worthy of being protected for future generations to enjoy whether they remain at the building or transfer to a place where more people can enjoy them. He had an opportunity to see them and they are great. Of greater concern is the fact that there are students' in that building. He has long complained about delayed maintenance being no bargain. If the school is allowed to deteriorate he certainly would not want to have students in there. He knows money is tight but to repair it down the road will be more costly. He appreciates her concern and calling it to their attention.

A roll call showed:

Mr. Andrade: Yes	Mr. Maynard: Yes
Mr. Costa: Yes	Mrs. Panchley: Yes
Mr. Hart: Yes	Mayor Sutter: Yes
Mr. Martins: Yes	

All were in favor

None were opposed

Motion passed

4. Presentation and Vote to Approve: ESL Pathway

MOTION: Mr. Hart – Mr. Andrade: To approve the ESL pathway.

Discussion

Mrs. Panchley said she was a little confused reading the information and asked through the Chair for Ms. Cooney to come forward to explain.

Ms. Cooney said the proposal is to increase the number of ESL licensed staff within Fall River. Right now the requirements by the state are either to go through an approved program through a university or teachers can take the MTEL in ESL. They do not really have a local program and recently they changed the test and it is a lot more difficult than it was in the past with a passing rate of 40%. In addition to passing the MTEL, teachers have to have 150 hours of a mentorship. They currently have teachers on waivers who have taken the test and have had some difficulty passing which is the case throughout the state. The proposal is to help teachers they currently have on waivers. They have vacancies they are unable to fill and their numbers of ELLs are increasing. The proposed pathway would be to increase the number of ESL licensed staff. In addition, after the SEI endorsement requirement for licensure for all core content teachers and administrators, all teachers will be required to have 15 PDPs – administrators as well – in ESL. They see this for some teachers who may be looking for PDPs in ESL as a way to be able to better shelter content for English language learners.

Mrs. Panchley said it was \$12,000 per course and would be two courses.

Ms. Cooney said that was correct, there are two 45-hour courses and then the third is free of charge. The internship is 150 hours and the two classes would be 90 hours which would leave them with 60 hours of evaluating, coaching, mentoring (not officially evaluating) and then the teachers have to present a binder that has to be signed off on in order to be approved for their licensure. They will have to pass the test and have the binder show that they received 150 hours of mentoring.

Mrs. Panchley said in the end they potentially could have 20 people go through the program for the price of \$24,000 hopefully with the intent of them passing the MTEL and becoming ELL teachers in the district. They discussed at Instructional Subcommittee that this is something they are really in need of and is hard to find. If they can grow them in Fall River and hopefully keep them in Fall River the district would be better off in the long run. She asked if Mr. Almeida identified where that \$24,000 would come from.

Ms. Cooney said in her Title III proposal she proposed that Title III pay for one of the courses at \$12,000 under their highly qualified PD for staff. She spoke to the people at the state and informally they think it is a good proposal but it has not been approved yet but has been submitted.

Mrs. Panchley said potentially \$12,000 would be from their operating budget and \$12,000 from grant funding.

Ms. Cooney responded yes and said as far as the SEI endorsement and part of RETELL, cities who receive Title III monies are expected to start rolling out the post SEI endorsement classes so this would cover them there for future PD for teachers in all content areas.

Mrs. Panchley wondered if there was any language they could use to try to keep people in the district once they provided this kind of training for them.

Ms. Cooney said they looked into it and deferred to Dr. Roy.

Superintendent Mayo-Brown said she would respond and explained they would need to work with legal counsel on that. They want to have their educators who go through that type of supportive program remain in the district and work with their students but it is a matter of what they can create that would be binding or not.

Mrs. Panchley said she would appreciate an update on that. It is always a concern when they provide that type of training. She is definitely in favor of this and did not realize that half of it may be grant funded which makes it even better. She knows they need to increase their capacity of ELL teachers. She asked that they apprise the School Committee if there is any language that can be used after speaking with legal counsel.

Ms. Cooney added that some of their current ESL teachers are working toward their graduate degrees so this would also provide them with additional PD.

Mr. Andrade thought it was a very good initiative and congratulated Ms. Cooney for working on it. He guessed that the course work would be offered in-house.

Ms. Cooney said yes and explained that UMass Dartmouth has two ESL professors and they have a proposal from them as well and are willing to offer the course on site.

Mr. Andrade said he actually began his career in the bilingual program and is very happy to see this happening.

All were in favor	None were opposed	Motion passed
-------------------	-------------------	---------------

5. Presentation: ACCESS State Assessment Results (English language proficiency)

Ms. Cooney explained this was another state test that English language learners who are identified as limited English proficiency are required to take. They receive their scores and have to write reports every year about how they will improve their scores. The test used to be called MEPA and was replaced a few years ago by ACCESS. ACCESS is a test that is developed by WIDA and now 30+ states are part of the consortium of WIDA so it is a national exam as well. The test is in reading and writing, listening and speaking; but the test content is English language development along with either mathematics, social studies, science, or history. It is in all content areas and measures their English language development. The data they were provided shows the most recent snapshot of where their students are.

Ms. Cooney asked if there were any questions and there were none so she continued that students are scored and given an ELD (English language development) level of 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 or 6. Last year 107 students (822 were tested) were at level 1 which are mostly the students who came to the district last August/September. It was important to note they are tested in January and the scores come out in June. That was about 13% of their ELL population and 145 received an ELD of 2 (8%); 271 (33%) ELD 3, 192 (23%) ELD 4, 80 students (10%) ELD 5 and 27 (3%) at ELD 6. In order to be considered to be exiting from the program as required by federal mandates, students have to reach an ELD level of 5 and school based teams are also supposed to consider their MCAS scores and grade level before they can exit. Most students are in ELD 3 and 4. What is interesting as they study bilingual education and language acquisition is a lot of students nationwide plateau at ELD 3 because this is the point when students can answer questions about content simply and the teacher then scores them on correct or incorrect. The state mandate is for them to move their students toward level 4 through 5 and to 6 to exit them with the necessary English skills to succeed in college.

Mrs. Panchley wondered if as a follow-up- possibly through email - there was a way to identify of those that were level 1 in 2014. With such a transient community looking at this doesn't mean a lot to her because she does not know when they came and how long they have been here and what they have done with them. She did not know if there was an easy way to show data of the students that were

with them the year before, what level they were at and what they are at now so they can see what the district is doing with the students that were with them for a full year.

Ms. Cooney said it was a very good question and that the state will be releasing their student growth percentile.

Mrs. Panchley asked if that could be forwarded to them when it is provided and Ms. Cooney agreed.

There was no further discussion.

6. Report: Fall River Public School's class sizes and recommendations

Superintendent Mayo-Brown said there is a report on Fall River Public School's class sizes in the Committee's binders. That is the most up-to-date class sizes for their elementary grades. They also have the results of their survey to teachers.

As they discussed in the last Finance Subcommittee meeting they wanted to solicit feedback from their teachers who are impacted by class sizes. Last Thursday, Mrs. Cusick along with Dr. Roy met with principals and teachers representing the early grades just to get a sense of their preferred strategy for reducing class size and if they had any additional strategies that may have not been discussed. There were more than 40 individuals present and a good discussion took place. The result of posing that question to the schools was that it is really school specific and context specific.

Superintendent Mayo-Brown continued that this weekend she sent out a survey to over 220 teachers representing their K-3 classrooms and the Committee has a copy of the survey. She reviewed the survey questions. To date they have 79 teachers who responded to the survey and there is a range of choices: 30% would prefer a paraprofessional in their classroom, 25% would prefer a co-teacher; 22% would prefer an interventionist and the highest number was 36% selected additional classroom, space permitting. The teachers who responded indicated they had 25-29 students in their classroom.

At this juncture they are still collecting data from the teachers and she would like to let that survey run for a few more days and they can cross that with the class size information. She recommended to the Committee the Greene School as a priority. She also recommended for the Committee's consideration that they go back to finance toward the middle of next week with some specific recommendations at that level and then ultimately recommendations to the Committee of the whole based on teacher feedback crossed with class sizes that will enable them to prioritize.

There were no questions or comments.

7. Administrative Apprenticeship at Kuss Middle School

Superintendent Mayo-Brown said she was requesting from the Committee the opportunity to have one more Administrative Apprenticeship in the district. They currently have two and she is requesting a third for Kuss Middle School. The recommendation is to assist with the succession plan at the school. Meg Christ is there as principal for the 2015-16 school year. This additional apprenticeship would allow them to identify, train, and support a successor for her. The funding for the position would be Title I.

Mayor Sutter said as he read it, he wondered if the successor is at Kuss presently.

Regular Meeting of the Fall River School Committee – Monday, September 14, 2015

Superintendent Mayo-Brown said their intent is that it be a current Fall River Public Schools employee. They need to go through the application process and Mrs. Christ would need to recommend an appointment for that position. They did a similar succession plan at Viveiros where Mrs. Christ identified Mr. Grandfield to go through that level of support and the transition from Mrs. Christ to Mr. Grandfield was seamless. They are looking for that same process at Kuss so that there is no disruption.

Mayor Sutter asked how quickly the whole process would take place.

Superintendent Mayo-Brown anticipated that they would be able to appoint an apprentice by the end of October. The apprentice would then work for the remainder of the school year in that role.

Mr. Martins pointed out the need for a date change on the job description. He then asked if apprentices evaluate anyone.

Superintendent Mayo-Brown said they are not the primary evaluator; they are learning to evaluate with the principal or vice-principal.

Mr. Martins clarified that they provide no formal evaluation.

Superintendent Mayo-Brown said they would be part of a formal evaluation because they want them to learn the process and be part of what they are trying to do across the district to ensure consistency and fair evaluations but they would not see their name as the primary evaluator or signing off on an educator's evaluation.

Mr. Martins asked if they indicate anything that is reduced to writing in the evaluation.

Superintendent Mayo-Brown said yes, under the supervision of the principal.

Mr. Martins asked if they were qualified to make comments.

Superintendent Mayo-Brown said under the supervision of the principal, yes. If they want the apprentice to learn the evaluation system, the only way they really learn it is to participate in it.

Mr. Martins said that is true but if they are going to comment they better be qualified to do so.

Superintendent Mayo-Brown said that was correct.

Mr. Martins felt if they were not qualified they should stay out of the classroom noting he recently heard a grievance regarding the teacher evaluation program and he felt there was a lot of subjectivity.

Superintendent Mayo-Brown agreed and explained that is why they continue to emphasize that they norm their practice across all evaluators so that the system can be as fair as possible.

Mr. Martins said if they want fair evaluations the subjectivity has to be removed and they have to ask what the standards are and how they apply. He suggested to the administration that they work closely with the FREA to make sure it is fair. He felt it is subject to someone's interpretation in terms of what the standard means.

Superintendent Mayo-Brown said she knows exactly what he means and they do work closely with the Association and there is a joint committee on the evaluation with members of the FREA along with

principals and others that is led by Ms. Lemaire and Ms. Cusick and will continue to meet to oversee that process. As she has said to the Committee before, the evaluation process is state mandated. It is burdensome and takes way too much time on everybody's part but it is something that they are attempting to implement in the spirit of growth and development for all. It is not a perfect system and there is some subjectivity when rating an individual's performance.

Mr. Martins said he agreed but they are there to learn and not to make an opinion of a teacher because they do not have the qualifications yet to do that.

MOTION: Mr. Costa – Mr. Hart: To approve the Administrative Apprenticeship at Kuss Middle School.

No discussion

All were in favor

None were opposed

Motion passed

8. Update: Summer School Programming

Superintendent Mayo-Brown said this is just an update. If they would like Ms. Ryan to describe the programs that were run throughout the summer - particularly 21st Century programs - she is able to do that; otherwise the information is in their packet.

There were no questions or discussion on this item.

ADDENDUM

MOTION: Mr. Costa – Mrs. Panchley: To accept the addendum for discussion purposes.

No discussion

All were in favor

None were opposed

Motion passed

MOTION: Mrs. Panchley – Mr. Andrade: To not submit a Chapter 74 application for FRED-TV.

Discussion

Mr. Martins said they have the recommendation of the subcommittee and it is not unanimous. He feels a big mistake is being made and a lot was hidden behind students. There is a lot of money at stake and is available that would come into Fall River under additional Chapter 70 aid if programs were made into career tech programs. He felt Durfee could very easily have five programs. He cited some examples. He felt they have been holding out on this for several years and if they multiplied the amount of money they could have brought in, it comes out to a high value. He felt the schedule could not be used as an excuse and needed to be ironed out.

Mrs. Panchley clarified for the Committee members that were not present at the subcommittee why the motion was made by her at the subcommittee and tonight. They had a presentation from Durfee and in the end the thing that stuck with her was that they have 21 students at Durfee that take FRED-TV 3. Most of their CVTE programs since going to the five period schedule require three out of five periods per day to be dedicated to that specific CVTE program to fit the sixteen pages of standards that have to be fulfilled in that CVTE program. Her feeling was that if only 21 of their students are going all the way to FRED-TV 3, she believed they would not have enough students that would take FRED-TV 3 along with two other periods a day to make this a viable program for the school. She also did not believe the amount of money they would capture would be an extraordinary amount. She does believe in CVTE programs and in expanding them but they need to pick a program where they can demonstrate that there is a need in that job environment in the local community. She did not think there was a large need for this specific program for job opportunities in the city. Most of all, it seemed

apparent to her that they would not have enough students that would choose to take the course and she felt the Committee should weigh in as a whole as to whether or not FRED-TV should become a CVTE program. She does look forward to Durfee coming back to them with their suggestions of what would best suit their Durfee students along with analysis of what the Fall River community would benefit occupationally from.

Mr. Andrade said that Mrs. Panchley had covered most of the considerations in terms of deciding not to recommend FRED-TV become a vocational program. The major issue for him was the number of students who were taking TV3 only being 21. They had to consider the type of student who traditionally takes the TV program – they are usually honors/AP students and have heavy requirements in terms of their classes. When they look at possibly tying up three out of five periods in their senior year to take the last course in the TV program, many would opt not to take that because it would take away from their opportunity to take other courses they felt were necessary in order to try to get ready for competitive college. Most students who take the program take it as an elective. There is a tremendous drop off from sophomore year when they take the first course to their senior year. He and Mrs. Panchley both felt that the most interested students' further requirements for additional courses would cut back the number of students who finish their senior year with TV3.

He also noted the extensive list of standards that must be fulfilled. He, along with Mrs. Panchley, feel strongly about the viability and necessity for having more vocational courses at the high school and his own interest is in doing something that would appeal to more marginal students to get them more engaged in school to prepare them for actual employment opportunities in or around the community. It was their conclusion that this was the wrong program to focus their efforts on. He understands why Mr. Martins had pushed it because there is a curriculum set which would lead them to believe they are part way there but unfortunately the elective nature of the courses seem to be parallel in terms of decreasing the viability of the program as a vocational program.

Mr. Martins said he does not know where the number sixteen comes from, there are twelve standards.

Mrs. Panchley said she was referring to the sixteen pages of standards.

Mr. Martins said he stood corrected but noted there were twelve standards and went through some of them. He added that FRED-TV is not currently three periods.

Mrs. Panchley said typically the CVTE programs as a senior they have to dedicate three out of their five periods per day.

Mr. Martins and Mrs. Panchley had further discussion as to why FRED-TV would and would not be a viable option.

Mr. Costa thanked his three colleagues for weighing in on this particular topic and said he can support expanding Chapter 74 programs and has by way of votes in the past. Hearing from his colleagues that the program would not be supported by the FRED-TV staff and the amount of students that are actually participating in the program currently is also a factor he would take into consideration. The one thing that he didn't hear and would be a factor is the cost. When they talk about rolling out Chapter 74 programs, it comes at an expense and he wondered if anyone discussed finances. He also noted that the reimbursement of \$3,600 comes back in the way of state aid, Chapter 70 and doesn't necessarily mean the entire \$3,600 is going to be allocated back to the school district. They do not see 100% of their Chapter 70 funding on any given year so he would be cautious when they say they are going to have this windfall of money.

Mrs. Panchley said those matters were discussed as far as how much space they currently have and she believed it was around 1,900 square feet and they would need 2,500 square feet, additional equipment is needed, and if they wanted to continue to offer it as an elective to as many students as they have now, they would need additional personnel. It was discussed and part of the decision but for her the overriding decision was how few students would benefit from this program and she thought they should be looking at a program that would benefit more students.

Mr. Costa thanked her for the explanation. The low number of students currently taking FRED-TV 3 is concerning but he thought Mr. Martins was onto something and going forward they should be discussing opportunities for students. He did not think they should become a wholesale Chapter 74 type high school but offering opportunities is important and is a discussion the new administration should be exploring at the high school. The intent is to prepare them for post-secondary education but there are a number of students who are not going to post-secondary education or the military and he thinks they deserve the opportunity to be suited for employment locally. He thought it was a conversation due to occur and was glad it did. He cannot support a recommendation for the FRED-TV proposal but would encourage the administration to come back and talk about more opportunities as they begin to gauge from the students what they would be interested in.

Mr. Costa thanked the subcommittee for going through the process noting Mr. Martins has been a staunch supporter of Chapter 74 programs and having been a vocational student in high school, he sees the value as well. He thinks there is a place at the high school for it without turning it into a vocational high school setting. He looks forward to any proposals that come forward in the future but he will support the recommendation not to recommend FRED-TV as a Chapter 74 program.

A roll call showed:

Mr. Andrade: Yes	Mr. Maynard: Yes
Mr. Costa: Yes	Mrs. Panchley: Yes
Mr. Hart: Yes	Mayor Sutter: Yes
Mr. Martins: Abstained	

6 were in favor	None were opposed	1 abstained (Mr. Martins)	Motion passed
------------------------	--------------------------	----------------------------------	----------------------

MOTION: Mr. Costa – Mrs. Panchley: To accept first read of the proposed changes to the Homework Policy.

No discussion

All were in favor	None were opposed	Motion passed
--------------------------	--------------------------	----------------------

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Attorney Assad said there was a need for executive session and cited the following:

“In accordance with Mass General Laws Chapter 30a, section 21a 2 and 3 to conduct strategy sessions in preparation for all litigation or grievances, as well as negotiations with custodians, paraprofessionals, clerical, FREA and FRAA as the Chair has determined that an open session may have a detrimental impact on the negotiating posture as well as strategy sessions with respective non-union personnel including Ms. Kelley Mahoney, Athletic Trainer; Mr. Evan Massoud, FRED-TV; Ms. Jessica Rodriguez, Family Support Specialist; Ms. Donna Cabral, Transportation Coordinator; Ms. Amanda Medeiros, Behavior Therapist; Ms. Ashley Estacio, Behavior Therapist; Ms. Paula M. Soares, Administrative Assistant; Ms. Rochelle Pettenati, Administrative Intern; Mr. Robert Hargraves, Administrative Intern; and Ms. Meg Mayo-Brown, Superintendent of Schools.”

MOTION: Mr. Costa – Mrs. Panchley: For Executive Session.

No Discussion

A roll call showed:

Mr. Andrade: Yes	Mr. Maynard: Yes
Mr. Costa: Yes	Mrs. Panchley: Yes
Mr. Hart: Yes	Mayor Sutter: Yes
Mr. Martins: Yes	

All were in favor	None were opposed	Motion passed (8:05 PM)
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------------

At 9:37 PM the Committee reconvened. A roll call for attendance showed all members were present.

MOTION: Mr. Costa – Mr. Maynard: To approve the contract with the clerical association.

No Discussion

A roll call showed:

Mr. Andrade: Yes	Mr. Maynard: Yes
Mr. Costa: Yes	Mrs. Panchley: Yes
Mr. Hart: Yes	Mayor Sutter: Yes
Mr. Martins: Yes	

All were in favor	None were opposed	Motion passed
--------------------------	--------------------------	----------------------

MOTION: Mr. Costa – Mr. Maynard: To approve the contract as negotiated with Ms. Kelley Mahoney, Athletic Trainer and the Fall River Public Schools as negotiated.

No Discussion

A roll call showed:

Mr. Andrade: Yes	Mr. Maynard: Yes
Mr. Costa: Yes	Mrs. Panchley: Yes
Mr. Hart: Yes	Mayor Sutter: Yes
Mr. Martins: Yes	

All were in favor	None were opposed	Motion passed
--------------------------	--------------------------	----------------------

MOTION: Mr. Costa – Mr. Hart: To approve the contract as negotiated with Mr. Evan Massoud, FRED-TV, as negotiated.

No Discussion

A roll call showed:

Mr. Andrade: Yes	Mr. Maynard: Yes
Mr. Costa: Yes	Mrs. Panchley: Yes
Mr. Hart: Yes	Mayor Sutter: Yes
Mr. Martins: Yes	

All were in favor	None were opposed	Motion passed
--------------------------	--------------------------	----------------------

MOTION: Mr. Costa – Mr. Andrade: To approve the contract between the Fall River Public Schools and Ms. Jessica Rodriguez, Family Support Specialist, as negotiated.

No Discussion

A roll call showed:

Mr. Andrade: Yes	Mr. Maynard: Yes
Mr. Costa: Yes	Mrs. Panchley: Yes

Regular Meeting of the Fall River School Committee – Monday, September 14, 2015

Mr. Hart: Yes
Mr. Martins: Abstained

Mayor Sutter: Yes

6 were in favor None were opposed 1 abstained (Mr. Martins) Motion passed

MOTION: Mr. Costa – Mr. Hart: To approve the contract as negotiated with Ms. Donna Cabral, Transportation Coordinator, and the Fall River Public Schools, as negotiated.

No Discussion

A roll call showed:

Mr. Andrade: Yes
Mr. Costa: Yes
Mr. Hart: Yes
Mr. Martins: Yes

Mr. Maynard: Yes
Mrs. Panchley: Yes
Mayor Sutter: Abstained

6 were in favor None were opposed 1 abstained (Mayor Sutter) Motion passed

MOTION: Mr. Costa – Mr. Andrade: To approve the contract between Ms. Amanda Medeiros, Behavior Therapist, as negotiated with the Fall River School Department.

No Discussion

A roll call showed:

Mr. Andrade: Yes
Mr. Costa: Yes
Mr. Hart: Yes
Mr. Martins: Yes

Mr. Maynard: Yes
Mrs. Panchley: Yes
Mayor Sutter: Yes

All were in favor None were opposed Motion passed

MOTION: Mr. Costa – Mr. Hart: To approve the contract as negotiated with Ms. Ashley Estacio, Behavior Therapist, and the Fall River Public Schools.

No Discussion

A roll call showed:

Mr. Andrade: Yes
Mr. Costa: Yes
Mr. Hart: Yes
Mr. Martins: Yes

Mr. Maynard: Yes
Mrs. Panchley: Yes
Mayor Sutter: Yes

All were in favor None were opposed Motion passed

MOTION: Mr. Costa – Mr. Andrade: To approve the contract with Ms. Paula M. Soares, Administrative Assistant, and the Fall River Public Schools.

No Discussion

A roll call showed:

Mr. Andrade: Yes
Mr. Costa: Yes
Mr. Hart: Yes
Mr. Martins: Yes

Mr. Maynard: Yes
Mrs. Panchley: Yes
Mayor Sutter: Yes

All were in favor None were opposed Motion passed

MOTION: Mr. Costa – Mr. Hart: To approve the contract with Ms. Rochelle Pettenati, Administrative Apprentice, and the Fall River Public Schools.

No Discussion

A roll call showed:

Mr. Andrade: Yes	Mr. Maynard: Yes
Mr. Costa: Yes	Mrs. Panchley: Yes
Mr. Hart: Yes	Mayor Sutter: No
Mr. Martins: Abstained	

5 were in favor 1 was opposed (Mayor Sutter) **1 abstained** (Mr. Martins) **Motion passed**

MOTION: Mr. Costa – Mr. Hart: To approve the contract with Mr. Robert Hargraves, Administrative Apprentice, and the Fall River Public Schools.

No Discussion

A roll call showed:

Mr. Andrade: Yes	Mr. Maynard: Yes
Mr. Costa: Yes	Mrs. Panchley: Yes
Mr. Hart: Yes	Mayor Sutter: Yes
Mr. Martins: Yes	

All were in favor None were opposed Motion passed

NEW BUSINESS

Mr. Maynard said on the opening day of school he went to the Stone School and thought the repairs were well done but noticed there were a lot of pigeons all over the roof, windows, and walls. He asked Mr. Coogan if there was anything they could do about the pigeons.

Mr. Coogan said he has a call into a company that they work with that runs their integrated pest management system. Schools are required to handle pests in an environmentally sensitive manner with no poisons or chemicals. He will see what can be done to discourage them but explained there is some sort of a food source nearby that draws them to the building and they come and go during different times of the day.

Mr. Maynard also asked Mr. Coogan how they made out with classroom supplies to start the year.

Mr. Coogan said he recently toured the store room with the Superintendent and they checked that not only the deliveries that had come in but were also sent out and they are right up to speed with where they are supposed to be and have heard very little complaints so far. He thought they were in good shape.

MOTION: Mr. Costa – Mr. Maynard: To adjourn.

No discussion

All were in favor None were opposed Motion passed

Meeting adjourned at 9:42 PM

Respectfully submitted,



Administrative Assistant for
School Committee Services

Please note: A videotape/DVD of this meeting is on file in the School Committee Office and is available for review by contacting the Administrative Assistant for School Committee Services.