

REGULAR SCHOOL COMMITTEE MEETING

Tuesday, October 15, 2013

6:30 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. Sub-Committee Reports
5. Superintendent's Report
6. Approval of Minutes
7. Request for Executive Session
M.G.L. c30A Section 21 (a) (2) and (3)
 - To conduct strategy sessions in preparation for negotiations with custodians, paraprofessionals, clerical, FREA, and FRAA and nonunion personnel including Marybeth Booth, Behaviorist; Taylor Brown, Administrative Intern; Richard Leeman, Administrative Intern, Nancy Magoni, Redesign Coach; and Dr. Fran Roy, Chief Academic Officer.
8. Committee of the Whole
9. New Business: Topics for discussion that could not reasonably be anticipated by the Chairman forty-eight (48) hours prior to the meeting
10. Addendum

MINUTES

At 6:43 PM, Mayor Flanagan called to order the Regular Meeting of the Fall River School Committee for Tuesday, October 15, 2013.

A roll call for attendance showed all members were present.

A salute to the Flag followed.

CITIZENS INPUT

Rebecca Cusick, FREA President

She is there to speak about class size which is directly related to the budget. She is worried that the large class sizes are going to impact the progress that is being made. Many K & 1 are hovering at 30 or higher. This is during the critical years when children achieve the foundation for which the rest of their education is built and having a smaller class can make a big impact. We know that children enter school with varying degrees of readiness requiring teachers to differentiate their instruction. In addition to academic readiness, we are seeing and increase in social/emotional needs. Meeting these needs is very difficult when you have one adult and 30+ students. At the middle school level we know that closing Henry Lord led to an increase in class size at the other middle schools yet research shows that middle school is also a pivotal time in a child's school experience as they get ready to enter high school. There are those that will tell you that class size does not matter and I believe that is because lowering class size is very expensive. It requires hiring adults to work with children but it has been estimated that for every dollar invested in reducing class size yields a two dollar benefit. Rates of retention fall, special ed referrals fall and graduation rates increase and teachers and parents will tell you that class size matters and there is research that supports that assertion. Two most notable and reliable studies are Tennessee's student/teacher achievement ration also known as STAR and Wisconsin's Student/Achievement Guarantee also known as SAGE. Both studies were designed to determine the effects of class size reduction on pupil performance. What these studies revealed is that students who are in smaller classes continue to outperform their peers even years later when they have returned to larger classes. These students had less discipline issues and were more likely to graduate from high school and go on to college and more importantly the greatest gains in the studies were made by low income and minority students. I have additional data on class size and copies to share. She has also included a handout of comments that came directly from FREA members at a general membership meeting that I thought you would be interested to see. Fall River's teachers are very concerned about class size. For the record, I will also tell you that I have urged all teachers with classes larger than 30 to utilize the contract language that allows them to request a paraprofessional for half the day. Unfortunately this puts our principals in a difficult situation as they are forced to move staff around to accommodate this request. I leave you with two requests: first involves money, I'm asking that you be creative in finding a way to lower class sizes or to provide extra help to the largest classes. Please consider hiring extra people who will work directly with our students. We need to have a financial backup plan or rainy day fund for a situation where we find ourselves with increasing enrollments. A second request involves a commitment of your time. I would like you to consider with permission from the Superintendent shadowing a teacher for a day in the lower grades or middle school class. Choose one of our largest classes in one of our neediest schools and stay for the day to watch how the teacher struggles to meet the needs of all the students before them and then you will understand where we feel the urgency comes from and always she is available to discuss this further at any time.

SUPERINTENDENT'S REPORT

Superintendent: This morning we had the pleasure of spending the morning with representatives from the Massachusetts School Buildings Authority (MSBA) as they completed what they refer to as their senior study. We have submitted a statement of interest to MSBA to do major renovations at Durfee High School which the Committee is familiar with. The next stage in that process was to meet with MSBA officials and senior architects where we discussed the items within the statement of interest and toured the building so we could show them first hand the needs of Durfee High School. Mr. Coogan, Mr. McCloskey and Principal Marshall were in attendance as well. We expect to hear either at the November MSBA board meeting or possibly the January MSBA board meeting in terms of whether or not we have been invited into the eligibility process and pipeline. I will keep the Committee and community apprised as we learn more information.

Mayor Flanagan asked Mr. Coogan to give a brief outline of what is in the statement of interest.

Mr. Coogan both the city council and school committee took action last spring to file a statement of interest with the MSBA on the renovation project at Durfee High School. Today's process was the second step where they sent representatives, an architecture firm to evaluate the school's current state for the possibility of advancing us to the next round. The next round would be an eligibility period lasting approximately 270 days that gives us time to explore the city's commitment for financing such a project, the MSBA's commitment in proceeding to the next step which would be a feasibility study and then that would develop some hard numbers and represent the real scope and timeline. It was an important step today. We had about a 2-2.5 hour meeting with them with a tour of a facility. Mr. Marshall also helped by integrating those items from the NEASC report that were concerns around the facility. The MSBA has a pot of money that is available for project. You then have a number of needy communities. They prioritize those needs. If we were not to be advanced to the next round, we can go back the next year. It would require another vote to continue the statement of interest on behalf of the city and school committee. They mentioned at this point there are approximately 170 communities that are looking to advance to the next step so there is quite a bit of need out there across the Commonwealth.

MINUTES

Thursday, March 21, 2013:	Finance Sub-Committee Meeting
Thursday, April 25, 2013:	Finance Sub-Committee Meeting
Monday, June 10, 2013:	Facilities and Operations Sub-Committee Meeting
Monday, June 10, 2013:	Regular Meeting of the School Committee

MOTION: Mr. Maynard – Mr. Andrade: To approve minutes as listed.		
All in favor	None opposed	Motion passed

SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS

There were no subcommittee reports this evening.

DONATIONS

Superintendent Mayo-Brown, on behalf of Principal Vinacco, requests acceptance of a donation of \$8,000 from BayCoast for the purpose of purchasing Google Chrome Books for RPS.

Superintendent Mayo-Brown, on behalf of Principal Marshall, requests acceptance of a check in the amount of \$702.11 as a donation from Target's Take Charge of Education®. The donation can be used as the school administration sees fit.

Superintendent Mayo-Brown, on behalf of Principal Marshall, requests acceptance of a check in the amount of \$9.21 from Ohiopyle Prints, INC. received as a sales percentage of items sold with the high school's logo at local retailers.

MOTION: Mr. Maynard – Mr. Costa: To accept all donations as listed.
All in favor None opposed Motion passed

TRAVEL

Mayor Flanagan noted there is an addendum for travel.

MOTION: Mr. Maynard – Mr. Andrade: To accept all travel requests as presented.

DISCUSSION:

Mr. Maynard asked if there was any cost to the School Department on the travel items and Mayor Flanagan responded that it did not appear that way with some listed as self-pay or fundraising or grant funding.

All in favor None opposed Motion passed

CONTRACTS

Mayor Flanagan noted there is also an addendum for contracts.

MOTION: Mr. Maynard – Mr. Andrade: To accept all contracts as listed.
All in favor None opposed Motion passed

GRANTS

MOTION: Mr. Maynard – Mr. Costa: To accept all grants as listed.

DISCUSSION:

Mr. Martins as I reviewed them their high salaries involved but there are not any in this is the teachers there is no MTRS retirement system could you pass Mr. Saunders explain that

Mr. Saunders: do you want to specific our only when am TRS is included

Mr. Martin's whatever I say to you also to the superintendent when I meet with her and also repeated an open session we've had to test this discussion I think I understand the answer but if I have the

question then I should bring that question out in public session because I don't like behind door discussions. Fine I just like to have it repeated in open session

Mr. Saunders: the kindergarten in Aspen grant for \$422,000 on this grant the NTRS is a grant we were putting parents inside the classrooms there is no NTRS for those parents those costs would never be in this grant that's the kindergarten one one. When we have stipends – anyone that's paid \$30 a day, stipend money is not eligible for retirement benefits so there is no MTRS on those. A number of the grants here are for that type of a stipend. There is also some nursing where there is an actual position there but it is coming under a state grant and the State automatically takes the MTRS off of us before we even do it so those FTEs would not include it. People that are paid under our regular salary, all their base salary is included for teacher retirement so it is going against their credited service and also against them for retirement benefits even though they are on a grant but the extra hour money is not included.

Mr. Martins: so the extra pay for service is not adding to the person's retirement benefits because they are not paying into a retirement system.

Mr. Saunders said they are not paying in nor does it go as credible service.

Mr. Martins: in the case of the kindergarten enhancement where there are and it indicates staff and paraprofessionals \$203K while they may not be paying into the MTRS because they are not a teacher however the city retirement system does and they are paying to that system.

Mr. Saunders they are absolutely paying to that system.

Mr. Martins: and it is coming out of their paycheck.

MR. Saunders agreed.

Mr. Martins: and that is the case with the remainder of these grants.

Mr. Saunders that is correct.

All in favor None opposed Motion passed

DISCUSSION ITEMS

#1: Annual Approval of the FRPS Accelerated Improvement Plan as presented by Superintendent Meg Mayo-Brown.

MOTION: Mr. Costa – Mr. Hart: To approve the FRPS Accelerated Improvement Plan

Mr. Martins as I review this why can't the targets that are supposed to be adhered to be determined as the goal to achieve. I see increase by 10% but it is not referencing the target that is supposed to be achieved. Is there an explanation for that?

Superintendent: for clarification what targets are you referring to?

Mr. Martins: it was indicated that the PPI was supposed to be increased by 10% but there is a target involved and it doesn't reference the target itself. It just says you are going to increase your score by

Regular Meeting Minutes of October 15, 2013

10%. I just wonder why the target isn't being used. That is what you are supposed to achieve for that particular year. As you go between now and 2017. Why isn't the target being the goal to achieve vs. increasing from where you are – which is below target – 10% which may or may not achieve the target itself.

Superintendent: I would refer Mr. Martins to page 5 under final outcomes just as an example starting on page 5 you will see we do have targets out there for PPI. PPI takes a schools CPI which is how we are reducing those proficiency gaps along with the student growth percentile along with extra credit for decreasing the number of students in warning and increasing the number of students in advanced – it takes all of those measures together to come up with PPI.

Mr. Martins for that the target was 75 and for those schools that are below 75 why isn't the goal of achieving 75.

Superintendent: well for those schools that improved below their target, their goal is to have them meet a target of 75. For those students that were well below – we use the smart goal process so we can set realistic goals. We could right that our goal is for all 15 schools to hit their target of 75 but I don't think that is a realistic goal although it is ultimately our goal. We know from experience that schools take time and make progress in increments and that is intended to capture the increment progress our schools take in achieving the ultimate goal of 75.

Mr. Martins but there are 7 schools that did not meet the 75 target. I can understand increasing but at what point in time does the 75 have to be met.

Superintendent: We have 8 schools that met their target of 75, we want those schools to sustain and then we had schools that were close so we won't those to hit it and then we have 3 schools that were well below hitting the target of 75 so we expect that they 50 this year and then their target the following year.

Mr. Martins: 2017 is the date that the CPI is supposed to be half of the gap.

Superintendent: correct

Mr. Martins: is there a time identified that the schools meet 75 or higher PPI.

Superintendent: Yes, the way the State has calculated the PPI, if you hit your target of 75 that is the State's way of saying you are on your way to making both your progress and performance goals.

Mr. Martins: but is that target to achieve meeting the 75 is that 2017 as well?

Superintendent: yes, that means schools are on track to hit their goal. Schools that aren't in the 75 are not on track which is why we want them to get to 75.

Mr. Martins: absolutely and those are the ones you are referencing by giving a certain percentage goal to achieve over and above wherever they are toward that 75.

Superintendent: the percentage goal?

Regular Meeting Minutes of October 15, 2013

Mr. Martins: some schools on PPI have reached or exceeded 75. They need to keep that to carry on. Some schools have not achieved that target so you have indicated in there that they are to increase their PPI by a certain amount each year until they reach the 75.

Superintendent: the 8 schools we want to sustain their target minimally. We have two schools that improved but below their target, the goal is to hit 75 this year. 3 schools that were well below hitting the target of 75 so we expect that they 50 this year and then their target the following year.

Mr. Martins: and then maintain it.

Superintendent: of course

Mr. Martins: I see some reference to CPI but it doesn't appear to be. This is a district/school improvement plan?

Superintendent: This is considered a district improvement plan.

Mr. Martins okay so by which case the individual schools from 2011 to 2017 there is a linear graph that you have to achieve CPI on and if you haven't met that then the following year that gap gets even wider. In here does it reference that the schools will achieve their target for CPI for each year because if they don't, the next year they have an even harder task.

Superintendent: it is referenced in a sense that it is captured in the PPI because CPI is a part of the PPI formula so if you are struggling to meet your CPI you are not necessarily making your PPI unless you have received some amazing extra credit for substantially increasing your advanced category and substantially reducing your warning category that might be a situation where you can meet your PPI but that is not happening in our district. PPI is a fair measure in capturing CPI you are not going to make your PPI if you aren't making your CPI.

Mr. Martins absolutely but CPI is more of a subject matter proficiency

Superintendent it is which is why it is part of the PPI.

Mr. Martins but PPI is more of a measure of narrowing the gap.

Superintendent: No. If you think of PPI as progress and performance. CPI is the performance – how are kids performing, how many are proficient that is captured in the performance piece of the index. The progress is captured in the student growth percentiles so it's using a combination of both of those factors. CPI is weighted far more heavily than PPI.

Mr. Martins when I see a target, that's my goal and if you've met the target fantastic and congratulations but if you haven't it means you have work to do to approach and meet that target. The CPI to me is very important because that is subject proficiency and you have to cut the gap from where you are to proficiency by 2017.

Superintendent: if you look at page 7 under final outcomes, I think you'll see what you are looking for "that MCAS scores meet CPI growth targets for math, literacy and science for all grades."

Mr. Martins: yes, it is there for the district is it going to be there for all schools

Superintendent: the expectation for all schools is that their plan will mirror the district improvement plan in terms of content and targets.

Mr. Martins said that was the answer he was looking for.

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

#2: Proposed Goals for Purposes of Superintendent's Evaluation

Mayor Flanagan asked if there was a motion to approve the proposed goals for the Superintendent's Evaluation which include: student learning, professional practice and district improvement.

MOTION: Mr. Maynard – Mr. Hart: To accept the Proposed Goals for Purposes of the Superintendent's Evaluation.

DISCUSSION:

Mr. Pavao: Chairman of the Evaluation Subcommittee updated the Committee that the subcommittee had met a week and a half ago at which time they had received the goals from the Superintendent. The goals were included in the binders that they received. The next task is to look at those goals and either modify them, accept them, make any recommended changes and/or add any new goals you as an individual school committee member feel are pertinent to the evaluation process. If you intend to do any of those particular steps, I am requesting that you send any of those changes or suggestions to the secretary of the school committee within the next 12-14 days/prior to the next subcommittee meeting at which time we will review any modifications that have been submitted. We will then go into final discussion with the Superintendent and with her agreement make any changes that are necessary or approve those as stated and then present the final goals to the school committee at the November meeting. The Superintendent did meet the requirement which the DESE has set forth on the evaluation of superintendents in that they had advised anywhere from three to six goals to be presented. She presented us with five. The only disadvantage that superintendents have in this process is they will not only be accountable to the goals that they have submitted to the subcommittee and committee as a whole but they will be held accountable for the progress of the Accelerated Plan. He looks forward to any recommendations committee members may have and complete this process so we keep within the timelines that we have agreed to and get this back to the school committee as a whole in November.

Mr. Costa: once accepted, I would like to make a motion to refer them back to the evaluation subcommittee so that we can finish the work that has been started and make a recommendation back to the full committee once there is an agreement on the proposed goals for the Superintendent.

Mayor Flanagan so the motion is to accept the proposed goals as presented and any modifications resort to the subcommittee which they will then present to the full committee, correct?

Mr. Costa, my understanding that the motion on the table is to accept the proposed goals. Once that is done, I would like to refer the proposed goals back to the subcommittee so that we can finalize them.

Regular Meeting Minutes of October 15, 2013

Mayor Flanagan: So the motion on the table is to accept the proposed goals as presented. Any further discussion?

Mr. Martins: what if there are recommendations for a change if we are accepting them now?

Mayor Flanagan: I believe this is proposed to the Committee as an outline so any recommendations, changes, alterations will be submitted to Mr. Pavao and then...

Mr. Martins: but then can the motion be reworded to reflect the fact that this is an outline and that the final adoption will be after recommendations are submitted.

Mayor Flanagan: I believe that was the understanding of the motion. These are just proposed at this time and then it still has to go through the final discussion and then back to the committee.

Mr. Martins: If that is the understanding, that is fine.

All in favor	None opposed	Motion passed
MOTION: Mr. Costa – Mr. Hart: To refer the Superintendent’s goals as proposed to the Evaluation Subcommittee for further discussion and final approval.		
All in favor	None opposed	Motion passed

#3: Modification of Timeline for the Superintendent’s Evaluation

Mayor Flanagan asked Superintendent Mayo-Brown to explain this item.

Superintendent: We discussed at an Evaluation Subcommittee meeting modifying the timeline of the Superintendent’s Evaluation slightly. The way that the timeline was approved would not allow for a public discussion of our student performance data. As I was setting my goals and as the Committee was approving the goals, if we alter that by a month and have the goals approved at the end of September the Committee can engage in a public discussion of the data. Usually our student performance data is not released until mid-September and you would be approving goals without seeing student performance data. I think that this aligns better with the release of the data and also aligns with what is happening out in the District. Teachers are submitting their goals to principals October 1st. principals are submitting their goals to me by mid-October so it is in strong alignment with the rest of the educators in the district as well

MOTION: Mr. Pavao – Mr. Hart: To accept the modification of timeline as presented by the Superintendent for her evaluation.		
All in favor	None opposed	Motion passed

#4: Exit Data

Ms. LeMaire explained that the Human Resources department had collected some data for the 2012-2013 School Year on people who have exited the district during that timeframe. She went over the data that is attached. She noted there were 131 people who exited and they reached out to all of them

Regular Meeting Minutes of October 15, 2013

(except the one deceased) to complete the exit interviews which she feels is a more effective way to get information rather than have them complete a survey. 57% responded (approximately 75 people). She read over the rest of the attached data to the Committee which included positions held, grade level, reason for leaving, length of service and additional information obtained during the exit interviews.

Mr. Martins thanks Ms. LeMaire for the data and said one of the concerns he has had is why people are leaving.

Ms. LeMaire said the top three reasons they heard were higher pay, medical issues, difficulty working in an urban environment.

Mr. Martins said most people don't want to share personal reasons for leaving but if they did it would shed light on some of the problems that they have regarding environment, etc. This is what he would like to see answers to.

Ms. LeMaire said they have expanded the tool that they are using this school year and are asking a lot more specific questions.

Mr. Costa: If someone is going to leave the district for a new position, is it just captured as the sole reason? I would be interested in what drove them to look for a new position. I am glad you mentioned that you are going to narrow it down to specific reasons. It would be helpful to know if it's money, travel distance, or working environment. He noted that they spend a lot of money and effort in training/professional development so it is troublesome for him to see such a big turnover. He added some questions he would like to see added to the survey:

- do they feel supported by their building principal/department head
- do they feel they are giving the tools to be successful in the classroom in terms of supplies, technology, equipment

Mr. Andrade said it was important for him to have some measure of stability within the staffing and they would be much more successful to having the staffing stable and not a revolving door. Did anything stand out as particularly surprising to you?

Ms. LeMaire: no – thinks they will get a better handle on it this year/better data.

Mr. Pavao: wondering if your office/predecessors had developed an interview training or standard document that is used district wide to follow during the interview process. He thinks part of the problem can be solved at the interview level/weeding out those who are just here for the training and then moving on. And thought some formulated process would be an idea to speak to the superintendent about.

Mr. Hart: a little surprised at results 61% higher pleased. How do you gauge that? Is this a good sign of folks leaving happy/without friction?

Ms. LeMaire: most people are very pleased with the district which points to the situation that people are here for the training and enjoy that very much before moving on to a better paying position. Did not see any red flags that need to be jumped on immediately but there is work to be done.

#5: Monitoring Report for the Accelerated Improvement Plan

Regular Meeting Minutes of October 15, 2013

Mayor Flanagan noted that Dr. Connolly was not yet present.

MOTION: Mr. Maynard – Mr. Hart: To accept the Accelerated Improvement Plan as listed on the agenda.

No Discussion

All in favor

None opposed

Motion passed

Mayor Flanagan said that Dr. Connolly could address the Committee if she wished when she arrived.

#6: First Read of the Proposed Policy – Bring Your Own Technology Devices (BYOT)

MOTION: Mr. Andrade – Mr. Maynard: To accept the first read of the Bring Your Own Technology Devices proposed policy.

No Discussion

All in favor

None opposed

Motion passed

#7: School Committee Participation in the District Capacity Project

MOTION: Mr. Costa – Mr. Hart: To approve the School Committee’s participation in the District Capacity Project.

No Discussion

All in favor

None opposed

Motion passed

Mayor Flanagan said it has been brought to his attention that there has to be at least two School Committee members on the DCP. He noted that Mr. Costa was one and asked if there was a motion to nominate.

MOTION: Mr. Hart – Mr. Costa: To nominate Gabe Andrade.

No other nominations or discussion

All in favor

None opposed

Motion passed

#8: Monthly Budget Report for September

MOTION: Mr. Maynard – Mr. Costa: To approve the monthly budget report for September.

DISCUSSION:

Mr. Martins asked Mr. Saunders and Mr. Coogan if the payment for transportation services to the bus vendors have been paid.

Regular Meeting Minutes of October 15, 2013

Mr. Saunders responded that they have not received the purchase order yet so the invoices cannot be paid and are not yet on a bill schedule to be paid.

Mr. Martins asked why they had not been paid/who is delaying the payment.

Mr. Saunders said he cannot pay until a purchase order is issued. There is an approval process that has to be done at City Hall. He text and they said they would take care of it. Once that is done then the actual issuance would happen.

Mr. Martins: this has been going on for some time?

Mr. Saunders: has been going on since the school committee approved the contracts back in August.

Mr. Martins: I think it is highly unfair that they bus vendors are not being paid and are expected to pay their employees, loans on buses, etc but are not receiving payment for services already provided. He then asked the Chair if he could expedite this.

Mayor Flanagan asked if Mr. Saunders knew when the request was submitted to the City.

Mr. Saunders: the requisitions were put in immediately. We did not get a contract number until Wednesday and then they were released and available for the City administration.

Mayor Flanagan said he would look first thing in the morning.

Mr. Costa said just for a bit of information as an item that was discussed at Finance Subcommittee, he still does not have a firm understanding as to why the City auditor would not release the money to the transportation contracts since it was already approved. The discussion we had was if we were trying to expend or exceed the budgeted amount, I could see City auditor not wanting to exceed the budgeted amount. My understanding when I asked the question in finance, this was money that we already had budgeted and pending the transfers that we are about to make tonight to fulfill our entire obligation but the money that is being withheld or not released is already budgeted money. He does not understand the philosophy or intent behind it. He asked the Chair to look into this as well for an explanation.

Mayor Flanagan said he is sure he had a reason and he will find out what it was.

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

#9: Acceptance of 1st Quarter Budget Transfers

MOTION: Mr. Costa – Mr. Pavao: To approve the 1st Quarter Budget Transfers.

No Discussion

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

#10: Acceptance of the Year-End Revolving Fund

MOTION: Mr. Costa – Mr. Pavao: To approve the Year-End Revolving Fund

No Discussion

All in favor

None opposed

Motion passed

FOR YOUR INFORMATION

MOTION: Mr. Maynard – Mr. Costa: To place the For Your Information portion of the agenda on file.

All in favor

None opposed

Motion passed

Mayor Flanagan asked Madame Secretary to send letters of condolence to the four bereavements listed.

NEW BUSINESS

#1

Mr. Pavao said for notification, the subcommittee on the Use of Henry Lord met earlier that day and there were three proposals that came to surface. One, recommended by Mr. Martins, was to make it a 5-8 school for September 2014. Mr. Pavao went back to the original list and picked two that had the most recommendations and the first recommended by him is to make it a PreK-8 and the third was to convert it back to a 6-8 grade middle school. At that time he had notified the subcommittee that he would not be making that recommendation back to the Committee as a Whole because after discussion with the Superintendent and other members of DESE, if they were to do that there is a 99% possibility that the State would come back and designate it as a level 5 school. The subcommittee will be meeting within the next couple of weeks. In the meantime they have asked the Superintendent to discuss the move of a 5-8 and PreK-8 with the stakeholders of the schools affected to make sure there is support. The hope to come back to the Committee with a specific recommendation on how we would propose to use Henry Lord at the beginning of next school year.

#2

Mr. Pavao met with Dr. Connolly earlier that day and there is one concern DESE has with the School Committee and its governing process which is self-evaluation. They feel we need to get a more comprehensive evaluation instrument in place and I agree with that. It has been voiced on many occasions that we cannot be evaluating individual members, that we need to evaluate the committee as a whole. I am working with Dr. Kelly and he put together a document that I will disseminate this evening for your review and we can discuss at the subcommittee meeting. A process which would follow the same format of the Superintendent's evaluation. We would have one evaluation for the entire year. The committee would set up 1-3 goals; have a mid-year review and then a final evaluation of the workings of the Committee in June. One of the questions that Dr. Connolly brought up was when it would be implemented. I told her we hadn't thought about that yet but as we talked about it thought maybe we continue the monthly evaluation until the end of the school year and look at this two page document and possibly put in a trial period and then in July follow the same timeline the superintendent would have for her evaluation. Mr. Pavao handed out the document.

Mayor Flanagan said he like that and thought they may want to implement earlier than July to show DESE they took the steps required.

Mr. Costa thought a more detailed timeline should fall in line with the election cycle. He thought they should roll it out in January and make the mid year evaluation the mid year cycle of that two-year term. For thought. He added that he thought they should be evaluated as a group and not individually.

Mr. Andrade said getting back to the Henry Lord Subcommittee, one of the items addressed was one of the concerns Ms. Cusick had earlier regarding class size. They would like to deal with the Henry Lord situation in a way that it would also help with creating space in classes.

REQUEST FOR EXECUTIVE SESSION

Attorney Assad: "With respect to Mass General Law c30A Section 21 (a) (2) and (3) for purpose of conducting strategy sessions in preparation for negotiations with custodians, paraprofessionals, clerical, FREA and FRAA and nonunion personnel including Marybeth Booth, Behaviorist; Taylor Brown, Administrative Intern; Richard Leeman, Administrative Intern, Nancy Magoni, Redesign Coach; and Dr. Fran Roy, Chief Academic Officer. They would be done in executive session with respect to the collective bargaining as the Chair has determined an open session may have detrimental impact on the bargaining position. We will reconvene and there may or may not be statements at that time."

MOTION: Mr. Maynard – Mr. Costa: To Convene in Executive Session.
A roll call showed: All in favor None Opposed Motion Approved

Mr. Pavao asked that the Chair call a brief recess in case Dr. Connolly arrived.

Mayor Flanagan said if she is there after Executive Session they would take up her issue.

MOTION: Mr. Costa – Mr. Hart: To reconvene in open session.
All in favor None Opposed Motion approved

Open session resumed at 8:22 PM, with a roll call that showed all Members were present.

Mayor Flanagan asked if based on discussions in Executive Sessions there were any motions.

MOTION: Mr. Costa – Mr. Maynard: To approve the contract as negotiated with Marybeth Booth, Behaviorist.
No Discussion
All in favor None Opposed Motion approved

MOTION: Mr. Costa – Mr. Maynard: To approve the contract as negotiated between Taylor Brown, Administrative Intern, and the Fall River School Committee.
No Discussion
All in favor None Opposed Motion approved

MOTION: Mr. Costa – Mr. Maynard: To approve the contract as negotiated between the Fall River Public Schools and Richard Leeman, Administrative Intern.
No Discussion
All in favor None Opposed Motion approved

MOTION: Mr. Costa – Mr. Andrade: To approve the contract as negotiated between the Fall River Public Schools and Nancy Magoni, Redesign Coach.

No Discussion

All in favor

None Opposed

Motion approved

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

All in favor

none opposed

Meeting adjourned at approximately 8:24 PM

Respectfully submitted,



Interim Administrative Assistant for
School Committee Services

Reviewed by:

Meg Mayo-Brown
Superintendent of Schools

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