

REGULAR MEETING OF THE FALL RIVER SCHOOL COMMITTEE

Tuesday, October 14, 2014

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. 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 Helen Sowinski, National Navy Defense Cadet Corp Non Commissioned Officer; Maelynn Clarke, Behaviorist; Timothy McCloskey, Director of Engineering Services; and James Medeiros, Assistant Director of Environmental Services.*
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

At 6:40 PM, Mayor Flanagan called to order the Regular Meeting of the Fall River School Committee for Tuesday, October 14, 2014.

A roll call for attendance showed all members were present.

A salute to the Flag followed.

Mayor Flanagan recognized that the crowd was larger than normal as they were preparing to recognize 81 students who scored perfectly on their 2014 MCAS testing.

There was a round of applause.

Mayor Flanagan said he was going to take the agenda out of order and move the Recognition Awards to this portion of the meeting. He congratulated the students and their families.

RECOGNITION AWARDS

Mr. Martins asked for another round of applause for the very bright students that were present. He explained that he was going to ask the principals to read the names of their students that had achieved the perfect MCAS scores.

Principals came up as called and read names as the School Committee presented certificates of achievement to the students that were in attendance.

Transcriber's Note: At approximately 7:20 PM, Mayor Flanagan called a recess for students and families to be able to exit the auditorium.

Transcriber's Note: At 7:25 PM, Mayor Flanagan called back to order the Regular Meeting of the Fall River School Committee.

A roll call for attendance showed that all members were present.

CITIZENS INPUT

There was one sign up by Mr. Adrien Bussiere. Mayor Flanagan called Mr. Bussiere to the podium; however, he was not present.

DISCUSSION

Mayor Flanagan explained that he was going to take the agenda out of order one more time so that representatives from the Department of Education were not kept waiting for their long ride home.

2. Status of State Monitoring of FRPS

Ms. Carrie Conoway introduced herself as being the Associate Commissioner for Planning Research and Delivery Systems at the Department of Education (DESE). The Committee has worked with Dr. Connolly, who was also present, as well as her colleague Brook Klenchy, Senior Associate

Commissioner. She explained they were there with good news and mentioned an email she had sent to the Committee which stated that they were officially released from their Level IV AIP and School Committee monitoring status. She congratulated the Committee and said she was happy to be present for this. She spends a lot of time in her work looking at strategic plans and as she reviewed what Fall River had put together, she was really impressed with what was done. She thought the theory of action made a lot of sense; the four strategic objectives seemed to come out of work that was important to the district and was not generic. She also liked the specific and detailed milestones that were included. She noted that the School Committee also defined clear and specific goals for themselves that will allow them to evaluate themselves over the coming years.

Ms. Conoway continued by saying she is sure there is much more work to be done to get to the point that all FRPS students are achieving at high levels but the important thing about the Level four planning work was that it helped get systems in place at the district level to support the work and she believes these systems will allow the district to monitor their work, evaluate progress, and make adjustments as needed. They do not need Dr. Connolly's assistance to do that anymore and will no longer be directly monitored by the Department as far as the Level four district status goes. She explained that as long as they continue to have Level four schools, they will still be considered a Level four district but it is not for the district as a whole. There will be school based monitoring instead of a district based monitoring. She congratulated the Committee again and said she was glad to be the one to share the news with them.

Mayor Flanagan welcomed Ms. Conoway to Fall River and said it was positive news for the entire community to see they are turning a new page with DESE. He does not believe the journey is anywhere close to being finished and looks forward to working with her and the agency as they continue to move forward in keeping the dialogue open to come up with best practices for students so they can continue to make progress.

Mr. Martins said he appreciated the good news. He explained that there were two areas that he was not fully understanding of; one being the goals to be achieved by 2017 using 2011 as a base year and asked if there have been any changes to that.

Ms. Conoway said there have been no changes.

Mr. Martins asked if that was still the objective.

Ms. Conoway said yes and that every district in the Commonwealth has their own unique path they are on based on where they started.

Mr. Martins asked if science will be a third part of that.

Ms. Conoway said science is included as part of the accountability determination but she did not believe it had the same gap closing measure and was more just about performance.

Mr. Martins said that is the goal that he wants to shoot for – 2017. He thanked Ms. Conoway again and said DESE can rest assured that staff will continue to work diligently to achieve the highest possible education for their deserving students.

There were no further comments or questions.

SUPERINTENDENT’S REPORT

Superintendent Mayo-Brown said there was a bit more recognition that evening. School Committee members would be drawing a name from the box in front of them. The boxes were sorted by grade level from Grade 1 through Grade 8. The boxes contained names of students who participated in and completed the summer reading and scavenger hunt and became eligible to win an iPad. There was one iPad per grade level to give away.

The names were drawn Grade 1 through Grade 8 by School Committee members and the names of the students were announced.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MOTION: Mr. Maynard – Mr. Andrade: To approve the minutes as listed.

No Discussion

All were in favor

None were opposed

Motion passed

TRAVEL REQUESTS

Mayor Flanagan noted that there was a travel request on the addendum as well.

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

Discussion

Mr. Martins asked about the ECET2 Convention that two Viveiros staff members were to be traveling to. He was curious as to what the acronym stood for.

A Viveiros teacher in the audience said she was not sure what it stood for but gave a little background on what the convention entailed.

Mr. Martins also questioned the requests from Durfee High School for two teachers traveling to Paris, France and Rome, Italy. He asked if the teachers attending the training were the same teachers who would be leading the student trip to Europe. He also asked if there was a commitment to the tour company.

Mayor Flanagan asked if there was a representative from Durfee present.

Superintendent Mayo-Brown said she could speak to it and explained that the School Committee approved a trip for the Freedom Writers to go to Europe during their April vacation. The two teachers listed are accompanying the students to Europe in the spring. As detailed by Education Tours, the teachers have to attend these trainings as part of the requirements for first time tour leaders.

Mr. Martins said he liked the idea of the lead person taking students to a foreign country receiving training and supports it but wondered if they were committed to the company or if they can go through another company if desired.

Superintendent Mayo-Brown explained that it was the company that was selected and the trip was booked with. That is not to say down the road a teacher could not select a different company.

Mr. Costa questioned the dates of the Paris trip being November 7-11.

Superintendent Mayo-Brown said yes; that would be just the teacher going as a first time tour leader and not the students.

Mr. Costa re-stated that it would just be the teachers going on these two trips and then in the spring they would accompany the students.

Superintendent Mayo-Brown said that was correct.

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

DONATIONS

MOTION: Mr. Costa – Mr. Andrade: To accept all donations as listed.		
<u>No Discussion</u>		
All were in favor	None were opposed	Motion passed

CONTRACTS

Mayor Flanagan recognized Mr. Martins.

Mr. Martins requested that the contracts follow the grants because he had a number of questions on the grants that could impact his decisions on contracts.

Mayor Flanagan asked if he had questions on just the grant contracts.

Mr. Martins said he had questions on the Title I and Title II grants.

Mayor Flanagan suggested they go one by one.

MOTION: Mr. Maynard – Mrs. Panchley: To accept the contract for Gayle Assad.		
<u>No Discussion</u>		
All were in favor	None were opposed	Motion passed

MOTION: Mr. Maynard – Mrs. Panchley: To accept the contract for Cultured Care, Inc.		
--	--	--

Discussion

Mr. Costa asked what level of nursing services they are looking to contract for (i.e. LPNs, RNs).

Superintendent Mayo-Brown said through the Chair she would ask that Ms. Ivone Medeiros answer that question.

Ms. Medeiros said they look for both RNs and LPNs.

Mr. Costa asked if they were having a difficult time recruiting.

Ms. Medeiros said it is for individual students who have in their IEP a nurse that travels with the student to school and back.

Mr. Costa asked if the nurse stayed with the student the entire school year.

Ms. Medeiros responded yes.

Mr. Costa asked if the district has done an analysis to see if it would be more cost effective to have the individual as an employee of the district to stay with the students as they progress.

Ms. Medeiros said the Director of Nursing has done that every year as they go through the contracts. Many of the nurses are also the students nurse at home per their home services. They have students that get 24 hour care.

Mr. Costa asked if through this grant they paid those nurses a per diem rate to stay with the child through the school day.

Ms. Medeiros responded yes.

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

MOTION: Mr. Costa – Mr. Hart: To accept the contract for Mt. Prospect Academy.

No Discussion

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

MOTION: Mr. Andrade – Mr. Martins: To accept the contract for Ranstad Health Care.

No Discussion

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

MOTION: Mrs. Panchley – Mr. Maynard: To accept the contract for Linda Sholes.

No Discussion

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

MOTION: Mr. Costa – Mr. Andrade: To accept the contract for R.F. Kennedy Children’s Action Corps.

No Discussion

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

MOTION: Mr. Costa – Mr. Andrade: To accept the contract for Southcoast Educational Collaborative.

No Discussion

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

Mayor Flanagan noted that they were moving to miscellaneous contracts.

MOTION: Mrs. Panchley – Mr. Costa: To accept the contract for uAspire.

Discussion

Mr. Andrade asked if this was the contract that they approved last year to help with guidance services at the high school.

Superintendent Mayo-Brown said it was and it provides a uAspire representative to Durfee who assists students with financial aid and applications for post-secondary education.

Mr. Andrade asked if a report had been received on how it went the first year.

Superintendent Mayo-Brown said she was not sure and would follow-up on it. uAspire would like to come before the Committee to describe the work they have done to date. She will schedule that.

All were in favor None were opposed Motion passed

MOTION: Mr. Costa – Mr. Andrade: To accept the contract for Rennie Center for Education Research & Policy.

No Discussion

All were in favor None were opposed Motion passed

Mayor Flanagan noted that they were moving to grant contracts.

MOTION: Mr. Maynard – Mr. Andrade: To accept the contract for rethink.

No Discussion

All were in favor None were opposed Motion passed

Mr. Martins informed the Chair that the remaining contracts are recommended for being funded by Title I and he would like to hold on them until after discussion of the grant itself.

Mayor Flanagan said they could do that.

Mr. Martins noted the last grant listed was not Title I.

Mayor Flanagan said they could move forward on that one.

MOTION: Mr. Martins – Mr. Andrade: To accept the contract for Claire White.

No Discussion

All were in favor None were opposed Motion passed

Mayor Flanagan said they would put the Title I grants on hold and revisit them later in the agenda.

GRANTS

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

Discussion

Mr. Martins said that when he reviewed the Title I grant and looked at the administrators he saw that there are eleven school-based instructional leadership members for the purpose of planning and evaluation at a cost of \$830,928. That worked out to \$75,500+ per person. Additionally, Title I has twelve instructional coaches for a total of \$821,898, coming out to \$68,492 per coach. He only saw ten teachers and five guidance counselors being paid for by the grant. He feels they are top heavy with administrators and too low with teachers and could not support the grant as written.

He continued that they would be discussing the results of the MCAS tests that evening. He found that Title I and Title II can be used to hire additional teachers for classrooms to lower class size. He noted that they do not have enough classroom space but felt in order to achieve their 2017 targets; they could have additional classroom assistance such as dual teaching.

Mr. Martins said again that he cannot support the grant as it is written and asked if the motion was for all or none of them.

Mayor Flanagan asked if Mr. Costa would like to amend his motion.

Mr. Martins said he did not think it was fair to reject all of them but he does not want to support those being paid from Title I or Title II and would like to send them back for revision.

Mayor Flanagan asked Mr. Costa again if he would like to amend his motion.

Mr. Costa said if his colleague wished to offer an amendment to his motion that was okay with him.

AMMENDED MOTION: Mr. Costa - : To accept all grants other than Title I and Title II.

Mayor Flanagan asked for a second and Mr. Hart said he had a question first.

Mr. Hart asked if he could have clarification on Essential School Health Services for \$141,860.

Mayor Flanagan said Ms. (Karen) Long listed it and looked to see if she was present. She was not.

Mr. Hart said he just wanted more clarification as to what the health services were going to consist of.

Superintendent Mayo-Brown said they do not have Ms. Long present but could table it until she is available if the Committee would like to do so.

Mayor Flanagan asked Mr. Hart if he wished to do that.

Mr. Hart said that was fine. He wanted to get more clarification on that as well as the Coordinated Family & Community Engagement grant for \$460,000.

Mayor Flanagan asked if Ms. Barbara Allard could explain.

Ms. Allard was not present.

Mr. Hart said he just wanted to get better clarification on those two line items. He wondered if the Essential School Health Services would be helping with the lack of nurses at RPS and RMS as well.

Mayor Flanagan asked if he wanted to table them to a future meeting.

Mr. Hart said he would if it was okay to do.

Superintendent Mayo-Brown said for clarification, there are nursing services at RPS and RMS. The School Committee approved that position at the last meeting. They can table them but noted that there are a number of stipends and salaries associated with both of those and she cannot speak to what impact that may have on staff if it is tabled.

Mrs. Panchley said the nursing grant looks like it is one they have had before and is decreased by \$21,000 from last year's grant. She would not expect that they are going to see additional services coming out of that grant.

Mayor Flanagan explained that the motion on the floor was to accept all grants other than Title I and Title IIA at this time.

Mr. Hart asked if he could add the other two grants as well.

Mayor Flanagan asked if Mr. Costa wished to amend his motion further.

Mr. Costa said at this point he is confused as to what it is he is amending.

There was some discussion to clarify what the request for the motion was.

Mr. Costa said he did not mind amending the motion but noted that in their binders they have the breakdown for that particular grant and it does indicate that the registered nurses are sought in that grant for about \$70,000. It also looked like there was equipment, supplies, and travel. He did not know if that was helpful to Mr. Hart and did not have a problem amending the motion.

Mr. Hart said he understands that they are not present and he does understand the breakdown; his reason for making the amendment was to see where the services were going to. He said it was okay not to table and he would personally contact Ms. Long and Ms. Allard.

MOTION: Mr. Costa – Mr. Hart: To table Essential School Health Services and Coordinated Family & Community Engagement.

No Discussion

All were in favor

None were opposed

Motion passed

Superintendent Mayo-Brown apologized to the Committee for having grants in the packet without the appropriate personnel to address it. It was a request of the Committee and those two grants should have been pulled out. In the future, they will be sure the staff members are present to answer questions.

MOTION: Mr. Costa – Mr. Hart: To accept all grants other than Title I and Title II.

No Discussion

All were in favor

None were opposed

Motion passed

Mayor Flanagan asked if there was a motion to accept the Title I grant.

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

Discussion

Mr. Martins thought they needed to listen to the presentation on the MCAS scores and said he would like to pass out some information in regards to the research that he has done that follows the Composite Performance Index (CPI) in both math and ELA. He thought accolades were to be given to all parties involved for the improvements that have been made but the rate of improvement, in his opinion, is not going to achieve the 2017 target on a composite district wide and they need to do something about it now. They needed to have more direct services to students in the form of teachers in classrooms even if it is dual teaching which he felt would get them closer to their 2017 goal.

Mr. Martins passed out a document showing the trajectory of FRPS Performance 2008 – 2017 and reviewed it.

Mr. Costa asked through the Chair to the Superintendent the timeline for submission for Title I and Title IIA.

Superintendent Mayo-Brown said the Title I grant has already been submitted as is and they can always amend it as things change.

Mr. Costa asked when it was submitted.

Superintendent Mayo-Brown thought in August.

Mr. Costa asked if why it didn't come to them in July or August.

Superintendent Mayo-Brown explained that they bring the grants forward to accept the funds.

Mr. Costa said they gave a breakdown of the usage of the grants.

Superintendent Mayo-Brown said that was correct and if they wanted to eliminate eleven school based administrators, they would submit an amendment to the Department the next day to do that.

Mr. Costa said he is not looking to do that but thought the Committee should get the grant information prior to submission so that they can discuss and approve it and do not have to file an amendment.

Superintendent Mayo-Brown said past practice has always been to submit, get it approved, and then the School Committee accepts the funds. The Committee always has the authority to modify the grant and an amendment can be submitted.

Mr. Costa thought it made more sense to bring it to the Committee to have a discussion about what they would like to see in the grant before it gets submitted.

Superintendent Mayo-Brown said they can do that moving forward if that is what they would like. She noted that Title I is level service; other than the contracts they have tonight, there are no new

services. There are no additional positions and it is a continuation of what they have been doing for the last several years.

Mr. Costa said he is not objecting to what is in the grant but would appreciate the opportunity to discuss it prior to the grant being submitted. Knowing now it will require an amendment, it would probably also require displaced individuals. He asked if they decided to amend the grant, if it would come at the expense of the people who are being funded losing their positions.

Superintendent Mayo-Brown said it would at any time they brought it forward to the Committee in planning or otherwise.

Mr. Costa said at least in the planning process they could give proper notice and if it came in July, it could be done before school started in September.

Superintendent Mayo-Brown did not know if they would be able to give proper notice because they are federal funds and are not available to submit until August.

Mr. Costa said if it has been a standing process, it is probably something the Committee should consider changing if they feel strongly about it. He thought they should be having more input in the discussion of development of the use of funds in each grant instead of approving funds after the grant is submitted and having to do an amendment. He asked if it was the same situation with Title IIA.

Superintendent Mayo-Brown responded yes.

Mr. Costa asked if there was any harm in tabling it for further discussion because the grant had already been submitted.

Superintendent Mayo-Brown said that was correct.

AMENDED MOTION: Mr. Costa – Mr. Andrade: To table Title I.

A roll call showed:

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

6 were in favor	1 was opposed (Mr. Hart)	Motion passed
------------------------	---------------------------------	----------------------

Superintendent Mayo-Brown said that she needed to make a point that because Title I has been tabled; the grant contracts will not be funded and some are direct learning services to students and will not occur. She further explained that the special education students will not have the online learning. Talbot and Morton 6th and 7th graders will not have their online learning as well.

Mr. Costa asked as a point of order if Ms. (Siobhan) Ryan was present to discuss the grant.

Superintendent Mayo-Brown said yes, they were absolutely prepared to discuss the grant.

Mr. Martins asked if there are people being employed currently under the grant.

Superintendent Mayo-Brown said yes, it is a continuation. There is nothing new and it is a level service grant. Positions such as interventionists are Title I funded. It continues from one year to the next. Sometimes they get a reduction in Title I that they have to make adjustments for. There are no new school based administrator positions in the grant. She understands that his theory of action is around if they simply get rid of administrators and add more classroom teachers, they will see a high trajectory of student achievement. That is not the theory of action that the School Committee approved in the AIP that they presented. The administrators are integral to the work. If they start taking VPs, Deans, etc. away, they are starting to erode the infrastructure that supports the work of teachers. She asked him to see what happens to instruction when there are no administrators in schools to support the very important work of teachers.

Mr. Martins asked if she is telling him that the twelve instructional coaches are already there.

Superintendent Mayo-Brown said they have been there year after year.

Mr. Martins said not too long ago there was some position swapping and it didn't seem like instructional coaches were important at that time for other positions. His opinion is the most important person is the teacher standing in front of the classroom.

Superintendent Mayo-Brown said she does not disagree that the classroom teacher is the most important person but they want to be able to support that teacher to work with students both in their learning of academics and social-emotional support. She asked Mr. Martins to spend time in the classrooms to see what they look like and see what the school-based administrators do in support of teachers. She noted that they were not central office administrators but administrators whose sole existence is to support teachers in the work that they do. That is how they have been able to make the progress that they have made. She understood that he didn't agree with that but also wanted to go on record to say that Fall River has one of the highest rates of improvement of all 24 urban districts.

Mr. Martins said he was not interested in any other district except Fall River.

Superintendent Mayo-Brown said that was great. When they talk about the percentiles of other school districts, she would remind him of that.

Mayor Flanagan said that Title I had been tabled at that point.

MOTION: Mr. Costa – Mr. Hart: To take the issue of Title I off the table.

Discussion

Mr. Costa asked if there was anyone there from Title I to speak to the services they have been discussing.

Dr. Roy said that she would let Ms. Ryan give the details but wanted to note for clarification that during the budget process when each of the schools presented their budgets and personnel; the positions they are seeing in the grant were discussed then and that was the opportunity for the Committee to comment and come to some understanding of why the Principals were asking for a certain budget. They were presented to the Committee and it is level service funding as the Superintendent stated. There are no additional positions included that were not discussed already through the budget process.

Mr. Costa asked if the process for developing the grant came strictly from building principals and asked what say the district had in terms of utilization for those positions outside of what was recommended. He clarified that this came to Ms. Ryan from building principals.

Dr. Roy said that was correct; as they publicly present the budgets.

Mr. Costa asked if the grant as submitted has contained in it just the positions that were presented during the budget and there were no additional grant funded positions.

Dr. Roy said no, it is a level service budget and if they had a new position, they would have to bring that to the School Committee. There are no new positions.

Mr. Costa said they are not certain what money they are going to get from grants so they can't say it is a level service.

Dr. Roy said that they are assuming that Title I is; they work off of that and the principals are working off of that. Their budget sheets from each school had a column labeled Title I and that is the assumption they are making. Had Title I been severely cut and they couldn't fit things in there; that would be a different discussion.

Mr. Costa said that is to his point, when the budget was presented to the finance subcommittee it was done in stages in late winter/early spring.

Dr. Roy said correct and that was the beginning of them building their Title I budget.

Mr. Costa asked again if the positions that were submitted under this grant are exactly the positions that came before the finance subcommittee and there are no additional positions.

Dr. Roy said she has no knowledge of additional positions.

Mr. Costa said that would make a difference to him; if they are telling him that only the positions that were presented to the Committee in the operational budget as listed as grant funded are the ones that are submitted then he is okay with that.

Dr. Roy said yes and she was getting the nod from the people who could confirm that.

Mayor Flanagan said the motion was to lift Title I off the table.

Mrs. Panchley thanked them for the clarification. She got a little swept away in wanting to give her colleague the opportunity to hear more about it. She understands as a spectator over the years how the grants come after. She also understands from having written grants herself that seeing the grants beforehand probably is not going to be realistic because they always get done at the last minute. She will not look for that to be done but if they need amendments, they can ask for them. She thanked them again for the clarification and remembered doing that during the budget process.

Mr. Hart said he was curious as to how much professional development was included in Title I for teachers.

Dr. Roy said she thought it was done in a variety of ways. Through the instructional coaches themselves, it is built-in, school based, ongoing every day in the classrooms PD, common planning. That is the intention of the instructional coaches. In addition to that there is money put aside for stipends.

Ms. Ryan said because of the status of the district they are required to reserve 25% of Title I funds to provide supports. They provide it through PD through coaches.

Mr. Andrade said as much as he agrees with Mr. Martins' contention that they would be better served with more classroom teachers and lower class size, after hearing this discussion it seems as if it would be disruptive to not approve it at this time. He thinks they should take a closer look during the budget process next year and ask the questions that need to be asked at that time. He thinks they would be creating some serious problems if they did it midstream.

Mr. Martins said there have been millions of dollars that have been expended during the course of the 2013-14 school year and asked what was done differently that is going to increase the rate of improvement from one year to the next that is costing millions of dollars as they go along each year.

Dr. Roy said they can discuss that in depth when they get to the presentation but she can tell him that the data does not support his argument about small class sizes. When they get to the data, they will see that their lowest performance is in grade 10 and they probably have the smallest class sizes. It is a bit more complicated than that. He may want to defer until they get to the full discussion and get through the grant section first.

Mr. Martins said he was hoping to get to her presentation and asked her to look at the document he had previously shared with the Committee.

Dr. Roy asked the Chair if they should do that now or during the MCAS presentation.

Chairman Flanagan said during the presentation portion; right now they are voting on Title I and trying to get through grants and contracts.

Mr. Martins said the School Committee has gotten themselves into a bind in that they have relied on these grants and expended millions of dollars every year. Each year it goes up simply because of inflation; however, the rate of improvement has gone up but it is not going to achieve the 2017 goals. They can continue expending all of the money by doing exactly the same thing they are doing now and they are going to get a small increase that will not achieve the 2017 goals.

Dr. Roy responded that the goal he is talking about is only 14% of what they are being held accountable for. There is 86% more of the work that is holding them accountable.

Mr. Martins asked what all the individual groups were that go into that.

Dr. Roy said growth, science, graduation rate, etc. are part of it. He is talking about 14% of the goal. It is there but so they are clear, it is only 14% of the goal for anyone of those.

Mr. Martins said it is very black and white and asked if they are going to achieve their 2017 goal.

Dr. Roy said it is 14% of the goal. If they were going to predict of all the urban districts that was going to do it; the data is showing it would be Fall River.

Mr. Martins said if they got to the 2017 goal of 88.75 in ELA and 83.4 in math, all of those other characteristics will achieve their goals.

Dr. Roy said that was untrue and he did not understand how the formula works. They have schools that are high performing with low growth. They get no CPI points for advanced.

Mr. Martins said that was like saying the CPI is not a measure of student growth and believed it was.

Dr. Roy disagreed and said it is not a measure of student growth and is absolutely not a measure of how a student grows from one year to the next. She said she could guarantee him that of those 96 perfect scores and those 81 students who scored perfect on MCAS, there will be some of them who actually have a very low student growth percentile and could have been higher.

Mr. Martins said there is no place for them to go because they are already at the top.

Dr. Roy said no, that is not why. It is a percentile.

Mayor Flanagan said they were going to move it forward because it did not seem they were making any progress and each side has their own opinion on the issue. He encouraged both parties to speak further about it.

Mayor Flanagan explained that procedurally they have to take the vote to lift Title I off the table. The motion had already been made and seconded.

A roll call showed:

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

All were in favor

None were opposed

Motion passed

There had been a previous motion made by Mrs. Panchley and seconded by Mr. Hart to approve Title I. Mayor Flanagan asked for a roll call for that vote.

A roll call showed:

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

All were in favor

None were opposed

Motion passed

MOTION: Mrs. Panchley – Mr. Hart: To accept the Title IIA grant.

Discussion

Mr. Martins noted two Deans of Teaching and Learning at \$178,284 (\$89,000 each); five more coaches and zero teachers.

Superintendent Mayo-Brown responded that Title IIA is a professional development grant. The five coaches are providing PD and are FREA members.

Mr. Martins said when he researched it; it does say that Title II can be used for lowering class sizes.

Superintendent Mayo-Brown said that is if they met other requirements within the grant. She believed that one of their schools that recently turned around, Viveiros; the Dean there is on this grant which is an example of a school that supported teachers in doing that very hard work with a very diverse population. If they start to take those resources away, they are not going to get the same level of progress and acceleration. It is a system with all the pieces working together. She asked that he not start pulling pieces away. She wants to reduce class size as well even if the research does not show that it makes a big difference. It makes a difference to their families and people wanting to move into Fall River. She agreed that they do need to reduce them but not by eroding the structure that exists to support schools in their improvement efforts. They need to advocate for the funding that is necessary to reduce class size, not take it away from areas that are working.

Mr. Martins said he is not taking away funding; he is altering the funds in which to bring about a smaller class size.

Superintendent Mayo-Brown said his proposal would take away \$800,000 worth of school based administrators to increase teachers. She wants to increase teachers as well as but it cannot be at the expense of other areas. It is a system that is showing progress and improvement and she asked him to please not take that foundation away of the work that has been done by their schools.

Mr. Martins said if they continue on the same route they are currently (holding up his handout) that line will remain flat.

Superintendent Mayo-Brown disagreed and said that the School Committee approved an Accelerated Improvement Plan to continue to accelerate their progress just as they have been doing.

Mr. Martins said he agreed that the progress has been going up but is not going up fast enough.

Mr. Hart made a motion to move the question and Mayor Flanagan accepted.

Mayor Flanagan noted there was a motion and second for the approval of Title IIA.

A roll call showed:

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

All were in favor

None were opposed

Motion passed

Mayor Flanagan noted there were still some outstanding contracts.

MOTION: Mr. Costa – Mr. Hart: To accept all outstanding grant contracts.

A roll call showed:

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

All were in favor

None were opposed

Motion passed

DISCUSSIONS

Mayor Flanagan said he was going to move to item #4 to hear from the Fonseca Elementary School.

4. Extended Day at Fonseca Elementary School

Ms. Brenda Boudreau said that she and the teachers standing behind her were there to represent Fonseca to ask to extend their day. The conversation came up last year when she and Rebecca Cusick were discussing why they wait until schools get to level 4 before they can do things for their students. Ms. Cusick brought it forward to the Superintendent. Ms. Boudreau spoke to the former principal to see if there was something they could do about it last year and it did not go anywhere. They met as a staff in June and more than half attended and were all interested in working a longer day for their students for the social emotional needs that they brought forward last month to the Committee. They met with the Superintendent over the summer a few times and are asking that they be able to extend their day for half hour. Their staff did meet again to see when they would like to put that time in and it was decided in the morning. They would start their day community building with responsive classroom which they are doing a lot with this year. They were approved for the wellness position last month which they are currently getting candidates for. The half hour would give them a good chunk of the day to work on the responsive classroom morning meeting model which they are putting in now but if they could get time for that, it would also lead to more academic time for the other areas.

Mayor Flanagan did not believe there was any action needed by the Committee but asked that it be an agenda item for November. If the Fonseca is serious about going down that path, he thinks it is something they should entertain and he will place it on the agenda in November. They could send more information at that time.

Ms. Boudreau said they have been thinking about it and discussing it since January of the previous year.

Mayor Flanagan said it would be on the November agenda for an official vote.

1. 2014 MCAS results

Dr. Roy began a slide show presentation (attached) and explained that there are a few ways the Department gives data. One is on the accountability levels of schools. The Department places schools in categories from a high of Level 1 through a low of Level 5. She showed a slide with all FRPS schools and their assigned level and pointed out the progress made from 2013 to 2014. She noted that from 2012 to 2014 they went from two to five Level 1 schools which she felt was impressive for an urban district and commended the hard work of all staff involved as well as the

students. She said she understands that they still have work to do noting the schools still in Level 3. She added that she had visited Watson with the Superintendent and they are positive about the trajectory they are taking.

She then went over the key PPI concepts noting that the goal/target is to get a PPI of 75. She showed where each school was at target-wise and showed that the district had reached their highest target yet and was at 61 for 2014.

Dr. Roy then moved on to the Accelerated Improvement Plan slide and said this was the theory of action that the School Committee approved. They offer differentiated support to schools. The Superintendent has taught her that the role of central office is to support school improvement work and with that - just as they would expect teachers to differentiate their instruction - they need to differentiate their support to schools especially with a limited central office. She showed a slide explaining the district systems of support to schools and explained each capacity (high, building, and beginning) and the help that is given at each level. She noted that one of the nice things of being at central office is that she gets to see all the schools and the work that the high capacity schools are doing so that they can bring those resources to the schools with greater need. She showed a slide showing what capacity each school was designated as.

The second part of the AIP is to ensure that the curriculum and instruction district wide is there because if they do not have a good curriculum, the high capacity schools will fall short. She thought there was evidence that evening with the 96 perfect scores for the first time that their curriculum is high functioning but they are always working on it and trying to improve it. The way they look at how they are doing district wide vs. school based needs is by looking at their grade level data. She noted on Student Growth Percentile (SGP) that anything 60 or above was extremely high growth. If students are at a school that is above 60, it is likely that they will outpace like academic peers across the State. This is a competitive measure. She also noted that 40-59 was typical, above 60 is high growth. Every school is typical or high except for Grade 10 who just makes it for ELA and has a lot of work to do in mathematics. She pointed out that grade level growth of a 63.5 for grade 5 is incredible work as well as Grade 8 teachers with 64.5. They are definitely seeing accelerated growth in math.

Dr. Roy showed a slide outlining the SGP comparison for urban districts. They are relatively flat in ELA and are working on it and know it is an area of improvement and need to accelerate the growth even more. In mathematics; however, they went from 45 to 53. The State SGP is at 50. She commended the incredible work by the teachers and those that work on the curriculum and deliver PD.

She then went on to District Performance: Proficient and Advanced is another measure of looking at how students are doing. In general, against a standards based system, are kids reaching proficiency? She pointed out that this year, again, they had a pretty strong year with high gains like they have not seen. She has been doing data for a long time and has not seen this kind of consistent growth across grade levels.

Looking at CPI change, the District's growth has begun to outpace what other urban districts are doing. They have grown in ELA across the district by 1.4 points which is higher than any other urban district and in math they grew 2 points. Lawrence was the only other district to beat them on that one. Science has grown 5.5 CPI points and no one comes close in any other urban district.

Dr. Roy said from a historical perspective, when they were in recovery and there were no district systems to support schools; that is what the recovery plan was about. They did not have a good central office or district systems to support the school improvement work in schools. They moved to the FRPS accelerated improvement plan which has four strategic objectives and they are finally seeing them come together to make a real difference for real kids.

If they look historically, since 2009 the district is closing the gaps compared to the State. The district is much better off now than they were a few years ago. She went over the math proficient and advanced chart for all grades and noted that they were catching up to schools statewide including the suburban, wealthy communities.

She asked what that meant for students and responded that in 2009 the number of kids proficient and advanced in ELA was 2,413 and in 2014 2,781. In math, 2009 was 1,162 and 2014 was 2,336. She said it is progress. It is not perfect but it is accelerated progress.

She showed the perfect MCAS scores since 2007 and noted that there were 96 perfect scores and is so proud and honored to be part of the work where they are having kids excelling. She does not know anyone in the district who is not working hard for the benefit of students. The Superintendent has taught her that their job is to support the schools to do that work so that the parents and kids have a fighting chance because without education there is no hope for the City or for themselves.

Dr. Roy concluded her presentation and directed a statement to Mr. Martins stating he could now try to disagree with everything she presented.

Mayor Flanagan felt her comment was uncalled for.

Dr. Roy said she has been on the podium for many years and every time she shows data, it is the pattern.

Mayor Flanagan said it was not the forum for ...

Dr. Roy said it would be nice if the School Committee members were held to the same standard, then she would agree with him.

Mayor Flanagan asked Dr. Roy to sit and said he would move to the next agenda item.

Mr. Costa asked if they would have the opportunity to speak to Dr. Roy about her presentation.

Mayor Flanagan said at the end of the agenda he would recall her.

Mr. Martins felt it was a public hearing and where discussion is supposed to take place.

Mayor Flanagan said they would bring her back up at the end of the meeting.

3. Progress of the Committee addressing goals on the AIP

Mr. Andrade said the one item they needed action on very soon would be the second goal based on the School Committee's self-evaluation which is the collaboration between the School Committee and the Superintendent in drawing up a vision for the district. The goal called for either an ad hoc

committee to be established or to have that task delegated to an existing subcommittee. The two possible subcommittees would be the Instructional subcommittee or Evaluation/AIP subcommittee. If they are going to do any meaningful work in terms of setting a vision for the district they should have some movement in developing that committee.

Also, with the other two goals, he had planned on meeting with the evaluation committee prior to the November meeting. Those two goals called for some feedback from the public in terms of how they feel the Committee is progressing in those two areas.

Mr. Maynard asked if this would be going back to the Evaluation subcommittee.

Mr. Andrade said the School Committee can make a recommendation as to what it would prefer or traditionally, it is the Chairman who sets up subcommittees and could make a decision on how he would like to proceed.

Mr. Maynard said he would like to see it go back to their committee (evaluation) because they haven't spoken about it and he was not going to vote on something he did not know about.

Mr. Andrade said it was discussed at their last meeting and knows they either have to have an ad hoc committee set up or the work has to be delegated to an existing subcommittee. It was discussed but is just a matter of how the work is going to be delegated.

Mr. Maynard still felt it should go back to their committee to discuss and he did not want to vote on something he had no participation in. He felt they should go one more meeting.

Mr. Hart said he doesn't see why it can't go back to the evaluation subcommittee. They talked about having an ad hoc committee but there was no definitive vote. It made sense for him to have it go back to the subcommittee for discussion and would be in favor of that.

Mrs. Panchley was going to make a motion that the Evaluation/AIP subcommittee be put in charge of coming up with a vision that they have to take care of in that part of the plan. She felt the Evaluation/AIP subcommittee was the right committee to handle it.

MOTION: Mrs. Panchley - : That the Evaluation/AIP subcommittee be put in charge of coming up with a vision that they have to to take care of that part of the plan.

Mayor Flanagan asked if Mr. Andrade wished to respond.

Mr. Andrade asked if that was put in the form of a motion.

Mayor Flanagan said she did but there was no call for a second yet; he wanted to give Mr. Andrade a chance to respond.

Mr. Andrade said they could do that and had to meet anyway on the two other items. If it is agreeable to the other two members of that committee, they could have a vote today as to whether the Evaluation subcommittee is going to be in charge of dealing with it.

Mr. Hart said Mr. Maynard had the motion and he seconded it to go back to the evaluation subcommittee.

Mayor Flanagan said Mrs. Panchley made a motion. He asked Madame Secretary if the record reflected Mr. Maynard's motion.

Mrs. Caron stated that she did not take it as a motion.

Mayor Flanagan said he did not either. The only motion on the floor was Mrs. Panchley's. He asked her to restate it.

MOTION: Mrs. Panchley – Mr. Costa: That the Evaluation/AIP subcommittee be the committee that handles coming up with a vision with the Superintendent for the district.

Discussion

Mr. Costa said he did not have an issue supporting the work being done in that subcommittee; however, in keeping with practice in all subcommittees, the work has to go back to the full body for any action. It is the prerogative of his colleagues that if there is something not in there or something they are not comfortable with, they can always make a motion to refer it back to subcommittee with suggestions to modify. He agreed it was the best place for the work to start and when there are updates, they can bring it back to the full Committee for discussion and approval.

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

5. Supplemental appropriation of \$911K as provided by the City Council for the School Department's budget

MOTION: Mr. Costa – Mr. Andrade: To approve the supplemental appropriation of \$911,000 as provided by the City Council for the School Department's budget.

Discussion

Mr. Hart asked if they were also referring it to finance in that motion.

Mayor Flanagan said he believed so and he asked Superintendent Mayo-Brown to clarify.

Superintendent Mayo-Brown said it would be her recommendation that the School Committee accept the supplemental appropriation, refer to the subcommittee on finance for discussion on expenditure of the \$911,000, and then it could be brought back to the Committee of the Whole in November.

Mayor Flanagan said there was a motion made and seconded.

Mr. Martins asked where the \$911,000 came from.

Mayor Flanagan asked Mr. Saunders to update the Committee.

Mr. Saunders said it was an increase in the budget that was presented by the administration to the City Council which they approved to increase FRPS's budget. He explained there are two parts to it: \$911,000 and an additional \$140,000 for transportation. The \$911,000 was arrived at during the budget process when they talked about charter schools calculation for the assessment and also the reimbursement. At that time, the city wanted to use the cherry sheet that was published in the

public document. They had communications back with DESE that said those numbers would change based on charter schools being approved. During that budget process they actually got to a funding of FY15 at 100%. The cherry sheet changed and the assessments dropped, the reimbursement dropped and that put a situation to keep them at 100% of funding so there had to be an additional appropriation.

Mr. Martins asked if they are talking about FY15.

Mr. Saunders said yes.

Mr. Martins said the required NSS for FY15 is the \$126,851,000+ and asked if that was an accurate figure.

Mr. Saunders said that figure has not changed. The net school spending (NSS) number that was the targeted amount has not changed. He further explained that the components that make that up are those on the city side which they call charter school assessment and also the charter school reimbursement. Those components have changed since the time the budget was adopted. If they stayed with the current budget, they would actually be under funded in FY15 below the \$126M.

Mr. Martins said that the charter school issue was a state adjustment to the NSS in FY15.

Mr. Saunders said absolutely. Those are the components that finally came through. The cherry sheet verified that number.

Mr. Costa asked “not an adjustment in the NSS spending amount; the adjustment in charter school reimbursement and assessment?”

Mr. Saunders said that was correct.

Mr. Martins said with all of that adjusting, the required NSS for FY15 is \$126,851,000.

Mr. Saunders said that was correct.

Mr. Martins said in addition to that is the deficit of NSS from 2014.

Mr. Saunders said that was correct. That carry forward will have to be added on and that is where the new NSS would be for FY15. When they (City Council, etc.) talked about the budget process, everyone knew they would have to address the carry forward separately. They wanted to budget that to address 100% of the targeted money for FY15. To do that, because of the assessment and reimbursement adjustment, there had to be an additional appropriation given to the school department.

Mr. Martins stated that this \$911,000 is an additional appropriation via the City Council to give to the School Department but yet they are still behind the eight ball for the combined FY15 NSS plus the deficit of FY14.

Mr. Saunders said that is correct and has not changed. The only thing that would have changed was if they did not receive this money; the FY15 would not be at 100% funded and they would have the

carry forward so the deficit would be larger. The action was taken by the finance administration to move the motion to the City Council who then increased the current appropriation.

Mr. Martins said he is glad they accepted \$911,000; however, it has yet to be clear that while they accept it they are still deficient of over \$3M.

Mr. Saunders said that has not changed during the process. They are trying to make it whole of where they were at in June when they set the school budget. They are still trying to make it that it is 100% funded for the current year; not addressing the carry forward.

Mr. Martins said the other issue is that they are now into October, the first quarter of the school year is rapidly approaching and they still have the deficit of over \$3M for FY15 which they are currently in.

Mr. Saunders said they do but he thinks there is some further action in the agenda on a capital improvement project that would require them to send in an amended return and it would affect the carry forward. The carry forward number as they submitted was \$3.5M; they have some actions that may require them to amend that and send it back to DESE.

Mr. Martins said capital improvements cannot be used for NSS.

Mr. Saunders said DESE allows up to \$150,000 to be classified towards NSS for a project.

Mr. Martins asked if it was for major repairs.

Mr. Saunders said that was correct and anything under \$150K they would consider to be not a major capital outlay and would consider it to be acceptable if approved by the School Committee.

Mr. Martins said yes; but above that amount is not NSS.

Mr. Saunders said that was correct.

Mr. Martins said he understands there are some major items such as failed chillers.

Mr. Costa called a point of order and said that was a separate discussion item. He asked that the motion be moved and they get to this discussion under item #7.

A roll call showed:

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

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

MOTION: Mr. Costa – Mr. Hart: To refer to finance the \$911,000 for discussion on its use for FY15.

No Discussion

A roll call showed:

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

All were in favor

None were opposed

Motion passed

6. Background Check and Fingerprinting Policy

MOTION: Mr. Hart – Mr. Maynard: To accept the background check and fingerprinting policy.

Discussion

Mrs. Panchley said she believes from reading the materials they received that for chaperones and volunteers it would only be required for overnight trips.

Mayor Flanagan said he believed so and asked Ms. Jocelyn LeMaire to verify that.

Ms. LeMaire said she researched a variety of districts including urban districts and volunteers who are going to be on daily field trips and in classrooms will not need to be fingerprinted but will continue to be CORI checked. Overnight field trips will have fingerprinting.

Mr. Costa asked if she received feedback from other districts regarding the cost associated and how other districts are handling it. He knows the way the law presented was that districts could not pick up the costs of those tests.

Ms. LeMaire said that was correct. Most districts are asking volunteers to pay those costs out of pocket.

Mr. Costa asked about staff.

Ms. LeMaire said staff as well. A few districts are offering a reimbursement of a certain amount but that was limited.

Mr. Costa asked if she had any idea of how they were offering reimbursement.

Ms. LeMaire said she would have to look into it more.

REQUEST: Mr. Costa asked if they could get some more information. He believes the more thorough checks are important; however, it is disconcerting that it is being asked of staff to pay out-of-pocket without any assistance.

A roll call showed:

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

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

7. Capital Project expenditure for FY14 – Letourneau and Doran Schools

MOTION: Mr. Maynard - Mr. Hart: To accept the capital project expenditure for FY14 for Letourneau and Doran Schools.

Discussion

Mr. Martins said this was in reference to two schools that are fairly new for the chillers that are on their roofs.

Mayor Flanagan asked that Mr. Saunders and Mr. Coogan join them at the podium.

Mr. Martins said it was a total of \$217,955. He stated that Letourneau was only about five years old and asked how old the Doran was.

Mr. Coogan said that the Letourneau was going on six years and the chiller at the Doran was from 1996 – almost 18 years old.

Mr. Martins asked if they were major components.

Mr. Saunders said they requested the documentation so that they had all the details; capital projects are not verifiable during the budget process so they asked for an audit trail to make sure they did their due diligence. These projects are funded out of the five thousand series which are capital projects of the city and only those are funded through bonds.

Mr. Martins asked if they have a bond on chillers or if it is a part of the overall bond on the building.

Mr. Saunders responded there is not necessarily an individual bond on each one of the projects. They are done in groups and then there is money borrowed to pay for them.

Mr. Martins asked if it was over a 20 year period of time.

Mr. Saunders said normally that is what it would be.

Mr. Martins asked what is being asked to be considered for the almost \$218K. Were they being asked to consider it as a NSS item?

Mr. Saunders said that is the request that they were asked. For any money to take credit for NSS - specifically on projects like this - the School Committee has to accept the projects for the monies to be able to be put into the NSS. They are being asked to do that but how they were financed is a separate issue. How the regulations read is that projects under \$150K would qualify.

Mr. Martins said it is more than \$150K.

Mr. Saunders said each one is below the \$150K threshold and he explained how they are accepted and credited. The School Committee has to accept them so that they can be included.

Mr. Martins asked if they have to vote to accept the replacement of those two chillers as a regular item of repair to be considered as NSS.

Mr. Saunders explained that under regulations there are projects that would fall below the threshold of \$150k so yes they would have to be accepting them.

Mr. Martins asked if they coincidentally broke at the same time.

Mr. Coogan said no and they are two different situations. He explained that with Letourneau it was a premature failure and failed just beyond the manufacturer's warranty. He worked with Mr. Pacheco from the Department of Community Maintenance and they had the representatives come out from the company that installed the chillers. They looked at it and the final determination was that they were not under warranty and would not be offering any relief other than a discount. The original quote was around \$115K-\$120K but was discounted to \$93K. There were a number of components that failed. They originally determined it could have been a lightning strike and did not want to exercise any warranty. In the case of the Doran chiller, it was worn out due to age and had been serviced a number of times. He explained how the units are serviced.

Mr. Martins said he does not question his proficiency at doing the preventative maintenance but when he sees two ... and he felt the Letourneau one was premature. He also questioned if it was approved then other items that are really capital cost issues will be broken down into small groups and submitted and asked if that is what will be coming next. He had difficulty with doing this. He knows they are strapped for funds but they had a discussion with regards to monies and having the resources/additional teachers go into the classrooms and are told it can't be done and they are relying on grants. When they have capital cost items like this; he asked where the money will come from and if it would come from instruction or any place else within the budget. They are suggesting that the Committee accept this as an expense applicable toward NSS.

Mr. Coogan said he is not suggesting that.

Mr. Martins said he or the Superintendent was the maker of this and asked if they were suggesting that.

Mayor Flanagan said yes.

Mr. Costa asked for a roll call.

Mrs. Panchley said she just wanted to state that she is going to support it because she does understand the situation the city is in with finances but it will be the last time she will vote for something retroactively that was done and then brought to the Committee. Also, it does not set a precedent for her voting in such a manner when things like this come in front of them. She stated for the record that this was a one-time vote.

Mr. Costa asked if the funding source was a capital improvement bond.

Mr. Saunders said it is out of the capital improvement funds and those are normally funded through bonds.

Mr. Costa asked about “normally” and asked about this time.

Mr. Saunders said he could not tell them directly because they do not have that information.

Mr. Costa said they need to know if it qualifies for NSS because they cannot use bond money to account for NSS expenditures.

Mr. Saunders said in the regulations they allow capital projects up to \$150K. When they got the clarification and the process on it there was a question raised by DESE that said if they are capital projects and bonded there would definitely be a question about whether they should be included or not. The current thing is that NSS is current resources being used...

Mr. Costa interrupted by saying as opposed to deferred payments over twenty years.

Mr. Saunders said that was correct. They do not have the Munis access and he only has the expense side. It came out of the five thousand series which are capital projects on the city side.

Mr. Costa asked if the information was requested from the city’s finance department or administrator.

Mr. Saunders said he requested that so that he had the detail of the expense and when it came to him it was listed as the five thousand series. He talked to the accountant and asked if the five thousand series are the capital projects but has not gotten a clarification.

Mr. Costa said he is not comfortable. Normally, he would support it if he could get clarification of the funding source but he is not comfortable supporting something and then later finding out it came from a bond the city is paying over twenty years.

Mr. Saunders said the reason he hesitates about saying most of the time it is done that way is because some of the rebates, etc. also went into those funds when they were looking at the \$800K amount so he can’t say 100% but the majority of the funding in the capital project is bonded.

Mr. Costa went back to his original question, and asked if Mr. Saunders had asked for a clarification on what the funding source is.

Mr. Saunders said he asked what the information was on where the monies were recorded; they could not view them so they gave him the detail which generated the next issue that it was out of the capital project. He has not followed up on that. He was given the information at 2:30 that afternoon.

Mr. Costa asked if they were back to no access again.

Mr. Saunders said it is an unusual one. Normally all accounts have been totally under their control but this is an expense that was not under their control that they are being asked to approve after the fact so normally they would never access these capital project funds.

Mr. Costa said okay and that it is an issue where they wouldn't normally have access to it anyway. He asked again if Mr. Saunders could tell him definitively how the money was spent.

Mr. Saunders said he could not.

A roll call showed:

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

5 were in favor 2 were opposed (Mr. Costa/Mr. Martins) Motion passed

8. Adjustment needed to comply with equity regulations for the school lunch program

MOTION: Mr. Costa – Mrs. Panchley: To approve the adjustment needed to comply with the equity regulations for the school lunch program.

No Discussion

All were in favor None were opposed Motion passed

9. Resiliency Middle School Hours for Students, Arrival and Dismissal times

MOTION: Mr. Costa – Mr. Hart: To approve the Resiliency Middle School hours for students.

No Discussion

All were in favor None were opposed Motion passed

10. Monthly expenditures

MOTION: Mr. Maynard – Mr. Hart: To approve the monthly expenditures.

No Discussion

All were in favor None were opposed Motion passed

FOR YOUR INFORMATION

MOTION: Mr. Maynard – Mr. Costa: To place the for your information portion of the agenda on file.

No Discussion

All were in favor None were opposed Motion passed

Mayor Flanagan asked Madame Secretary to send bereavements to the families of those listed under the notices of death.

Mr. Martins noted there were appointments.

Mayor Flanagan said they were placed on file.

Mr. Martins asked if they could tell him what "document needed" meant that was listed on some new hires.

Superintendent Mayo-Brown said they are appointments that are 90 day appointments noted under the effective date consistent with DESE regulations around licensure. In essence, it means the candidate does not hold a Massachusetts license and they are in the process of either applying for a waiver or temporary license so they can complete the Massachusetts requirements.

Mr. Martins asked if most of them are Rhode Island people who are seeking reciprocity to Massachusetts.

Superintendent Mayo-Brown said that is very often the case; however, there may be a case where a teacher is licensed in one content area and is working with students with moderate special needs and would need a waiver in order to do that.

Mr. Martins said there is one Massachusetts resident that has been appointed with “document needed” and asked if that person is seeking a waiver.

Superintendent Mayo-Brown asked which page he was on.

Mr. Martins said page 8 for a science teacher at Talbot. They have a master’s degree and he is not questioning the qualifications.

Superintendent Mayo-Brown said they have either applied for a waiver or their license is pending. This could be a situation where the individual could have gone to school in Rhode Island. They are so close to Rhode Island and there is no reciprocity so they are often in the situation of needing to apply for waivers for educators so that they can take the MTEs and give them time to complete.

Mr. Costa noted there were a couple of items on the addendum that needed approval.

Mayor Flanagan thanked Mr. Costa.

ADDENDUM ITEMS

MOTION: Mr. Costa - Mr. Hart: To approve the pole installation and grant the easement to connect the utilities at Henry Lord Middle.

Discussion

Mr. Hart said this was a long time coming and thanked Mr. Coogan and those involved in this projects noting that the groups that use the fields for athletic events are very appreciative.

All were in favor

None were opposed

Motion passed

MOTION: Mr. Maynard - Mr. Andrade: To approve an additional five FTE paraprofessional positions to reduce class size per the FREA contract.

Discussion

Mr. Martins asked what the funding source was.

Superintendent Mayo-Brown said the funding source is the operating budget and explained that her request was brought forth because teachers or principals will contact her if they have a class size that has gone over 31. The FREA contract is clear that they need to provide paraprofessional

resources in those instances for large class sizes. She is trying to avoid a situation where they delay that resource because they need to come back to the Committee at the next monthly meeting to request those positions. She is asking for authorization from the School Committee for the five FTEs to only be deployed with two conditions. One, that they are needed by the contract; Two, Mr. Saunders is able to verify that there is enough money in the paraprofessional line item which she believes they have at this time to go ahead and do that. It is really just to accelerate that resource into the classroom as the need arises.

Mrs. Panchley asked if she said over 31 and if that meant 32 or more.

Superintendent Mayo-Brown said yes, the language is that there is a half time paraprofessional for classrooms over 31 and then a full time if it is higher than that.

Mrs. Panchley said she is aware of a classroom that has 31 with no paraprofessional at all and hopes that this would help that classroom.

Superintendent Mayo-Brown said they certainly want to be able to give at least half time paraprofessionals to those situations.

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

NEW BUSINESS

Mayor Flanagan said that some Watson parents have contacted him regarding complaints of the playground being used after school hours and asked Mr. Coogan if the playgrounds are allowed to be used after school hours.

Mr. Coogan said they typically will work with the police and put up signs saying no loitering or no trespassing. In the case of the Watson, it is not a gated playground and there is no way to restrict access to that area. Posting the signs allows the police to take action if it is later at night, etc. but during the rest of the time it is available to those children in the neighborhood to use the resource appropriately.

REQUEST: Mayor Flanagan asked if he could put a sign up and then let the neighbors know it was done.

Mr. Coogan said they have already taken action on that and if the signs are not up yet, he would follow-up.

1. 2014 MCAS

Mayor Flanagan asked Dr. Roy to join them at the podium to finish the discussion regarding MCAS Scores.

Mr. Costa thanked Dr. Roy for the presentation and said she mentioned that they currently have five Level 3 schools and that one was Durfee. He has mentioned in conversations with the Superintendent asking what interventions or services they are putting in to the current Level 3

schools. He thinks they have done a great job addressing schools once they become Level 4 but is trying to find out how they intervene to keep them from going to Level 4.

Dr. Roy said it differs. The Level 3 schools are split into two groups and noted that a school like Morton has really turned the corner. Even though they are still a Level 3 school they are continuing on the trajectory of the hard work of the past two years of restructuring the school. Fonseca and Durfee are both considered intensive schools so as beginning capacity schools there are two different strategies they are working off of. The Superintendent can speak more on the Fonseca but they both involve restructuring the school very much as they would if they were a Level 4 school but without the redesign grant and building capacity through different systems that have been restructured at the school. They can give more details on the individual schools if they would like.

Mr. Costa said he would just like to keep it in the forefront. He was particularly concerned about the high school even though they were all important but because some of the data she showed on student growth percentages, they have either remained flat or dipped in some cases. It is the only public high school and they do not want a designation of a Level 4. He said he understands that with redesign often time comes cost but they are in the process now of discussing how to utilize the additional \$911K that they just approved and his hope is that through further discussions and action by both the city's administration and the City Council that additional funds will be provided to the district in terms of its shortfall in NSS. With those funds, he thinks it is prudent to look at where they are in the Level 3 schools and if they are making a turn toward a Level 2 and just have not received the designation because it is fragile growth. The schools in which they don't see the turnaround happening may need an intervention before it becomes Level 4.

Dr. Roy said they agree. Specific to Durfee, the data is there and they are not seeing the same level of rigor that they are seeing in the K-8 system. The data shows that the level of rigor from 8th through 10th grade is not there so the department head model was not working for them. They now have two individuals overseeing and working really hard on building teacher capacity around rigorous thinking and learning. They have been using them as sounding boards around their PD and how they use their half days, trying to implement a teacher leader model. They have connected them with Viveiros and Stephanie Kennedy because they have done such a great job with the teacher leader model and they are trying to get that into Durfee. The focus at Durfee right now is building that core/tier one instruction and making it more rigorous thinking. As far as resources, it is not necessarily more staff but it is PD. They are trying to contract with EDC for their mathematics department which is about the mathematical practices of the common core around rigorous thinking. Once they get that settled they may be coming back to the Committee asking for some support for a consultant to develop PD.

Mr. Costa said those types of interventions, when they talk about building capacity, is something that is going to take time in order to build. He is more concerned where they are on a continuum of Level 3 and if they are quickly approaching Level 4. He asked if they are, what immediate interventions they can put in place to pre-empt that. He felt a lot of the things mentioned are not going to effectuate the change they need immediately and will take some time to take hold.

Dr. Roy said she thinks the immediate change is going to happen from a collaboration and discussion between the administrators and the staff around the rigor. The high priority for that staff is to increase rigorous thinking. If they think about what they want for their child; they want them in a class where they are being challenged. There are lots of areas they can focus on but if they can ask what is going to stop the bleeding and take the turn, she thinks that Durfee staff, as well as central

office, are in agreement that it is around getting the rigor back in high school and getting rigorous thinking back into high school kids.

Mr. Costa said his last point is that they changed the culture at the high school which had been an ongoing process for the last several years; now they need to shift gears and work on the rigor and building capacity in those areas. He hopes that remains at the forefront because they are quickly losing time and he fears that the high school will become a Level 4. They know that it is a three-year designation. It is important that they continue to have these conversations and put the focus on the leadership of the high school to make that happen and to come back with plans to the Committee for additional resources. He noted that they have plenty of staff and what they need to figure out is what other resources in terms of PD, etc. they can put in place to help change the tide.

Mr. Martins asked Dr. Roy if she put together the MCAS information.

Dr. Roy said she did the cover letter and the summary and Fatima, the Director of Assessment, put together the data.

Mr. Martins asked about a document that was not provided to them in the binder that is on the Department of Education's website under accountability.

Superintendent Mayo-Brown said that she could speak to that. She did not want to provide that document because it has a cumulative PPI which is confusing because it is not the annual PPI. They are held accountable for the annual PPI which is not listed. She asked Fatima to put together information that was specific to the annual PPI not four-year cumulative PPI.

Mr. Martins said the PPI is over a four-year period of time.

Superintendent Mayo Brown said the cumulative is and is weighted but the annual is not.

Mr. Martins said there are bunch of items contained in the calculation of the cumulative PPI.

Superintendent Mayo Brown said as well as the annual PPI. They both count the same items into the PPI. The only difference is that one is a four year trend weighted and the other is how they did last year.

Mr. Martins said yes but the goal of 75 also becomes an annual goal.

Superintendent Mayo-Brown said to meet their PPI target, no matter what school you are in the Commonwealth, the target is always 75.

Mr. Martins said if they could go back to the PPI slide which Dr. Roy did.

Mr. Martins noted that Fall River's annual PPI for 2014 is at 61.

Superintendent Mayo-Brown said yes.

Mr. Martins noted that that was not 75. He is not their adversary but certainly she is a dedicated person to education and he would like to think that he is, too, and when he looks at the goals that are set for them he asks where they are going with the data and how are they going to get where

they are supposed to be at a certain time. He asked what the significance of the overall rating was other than its literary meaning. He noted that he had passed out to everyone the trajectory. Those are the overall ratings of the schools. Some of them are very low and he questioned why. He questioned the school levels in relation to the overall percentile.

Dr. Roy said there are two different measures that go into the accountability. The percentile (75%) is based on performance, so their CPI per se and 25% is based on growth. If they fall below the 20th percentile, they are a Level 3, 4, or 5. If they are above the 20th percentile then they can be a Level 1 or Level 2. It is part of the formula. She also explained that in order to be a Level 3, 4 or 5 the State will look at two measures; one is percentile and one is PPI. They are both included in that data. For example, they have five Level 1 schools that all have very different percentiles.

Mr. Martins said that he sees that.

Superintendent Mayo Brown asked if she could contribute to the discussion for clarification. She explained that under State Law the State is required to always identify the lowest 20% of schools. That is why they created the percentile ranking. Those schools are always Level 3 and then the Commissioner can go into that group of Level 3 schools because they are in the bottom 20% and determine (subjectively) the Level 4 and 5 schools.

Mr. Martins asked if she would say that those schools that are listed below 20% are in need of additional help.

Superintendent Mayo Brown said any Level 3 school is in need of additional help which is why they are targeting them. They want all of their schools to be Level 1 because that means they are closing that gap. Level 2 means they are closing the gap with the exception of maybe one or two subgroups. Level 3 means they are sitting in the bottom 20%. It is the district's goal, just as they did with the Viveiros and Tansey, to get schools up and out of Level 3 because it is dangerous to be sitting in that bottom 20% and more importantly they are not meeting the needs of students when the school is flagged as Level 3.

Mr. Martins said that she knows as well as he the schools that are experiencing some difficulty. He will not accept the issue that it is the teachers fault. Those schools that are experiencing difficulty need more assistance. Professional development is part of it but not in total. Administrative support from central administration helps but not in total. He asked what happens if they have a very rigorous curriculum taught by a very demanding teacher but yet students do not understand the material. He congratulated them for the increase but questioned if the rate of increase will get them where they need to be in 2017.

Dr. Roy said she does think that they can definitely get to 75 districtwide PPI by 2017. She will agree that they are on that trajectory. Each year their annual PPI is increasing and each year they have schools increasing their level.

Mr. Martins asked what the consequences of not achieving CPI by 2017.

Dr. Roy said it is a good question and she did not know. She said in terms of PPI that would account for 14% or 20% of their PPI score. It is possible that they could not reach that but still meet a PPI of 75.

Mr. Martins said if they do not reach the 75, they are not going to reach the CPI.

Dr. Roy said not necessarily.

Mr. Martins explained that if he was a student who may be a little bit below average understanding the material and doesn't get the help, he is not going to achieve PPI or CPI. He questioned how he is going to get that help.

Dr. Roy said she thought he should ask Doran, Viveiros, Kuss and Silvia what they do to support children because their students are performing beyond expectations. She noted Doran and Viveiros who have a 90% free and reduced lunch and the fact that they are above the 20th percentile now. She thought the best way for Mr. Martins to look at his concern around CPI is to look at the levels of schools. If they had all schools in Level 1 and 2, their CPI would have gone up enough. Instead of being focused on a measure that is only 14% overall, if they say that their goal is more about getting all schools to be Level 1 or 2 then she can, with some confidence, tell him they have created schools where most kids can learn whether they are a high-level student, a struggling learner, an English language learner, or a student with special needs. Level 1 or Level 2 signifies to her that these are environments that are conducive to moving all kids forward and in their Level 3 schools; they have some work to do.

Mr. Martins said they teach the student from where they find the student.

Mayor Flanagan reminded Dr. Roy and Mr. Martins that they do still have a very lengthy executive session.

Mr. Martins yielded.

Mayor Flanagan asked if there were any further questions on MCAS scores.

Mr. Martins asked that Dr. Roy to take a look at take a look at Durfee, Watson, Fonseca, and Doran. He said Doran has increased from 9 to 21 to 34 and are 20% now. They were at 21 last year and questioned if it would drop. He hoped not.

Dr. Roy said they are hoping the same thing although she would say that the Level 1 status is showing that there are established systems in place. She has every bit of confidence that they will not drop.

Mr. Martins said absolutely so but the other schools that need help; he is interested in the overall composite of the district. He noted that he found it amazing that RPS has insufficient data but yet they have 250 kids in the school. He yielded.

Mr. Andrade said he knows they talked about the importance of supporting Durfee but another school that he thinks they should take a serious look at supporting this year is Fonseca. They have teetered on falling to Level 4 for several years. If they looked at the statistics they had on the screen earlier, they had an annual PPI of 85 which really jumped off the page at him. He added that there are some good things happening and teachers seem to be very enthused. They are asking the Committee for some extra time and he thought they should be looking at where else they can help them and support them. One of the areas they have to take a look at is the numbers overall and not

just class-size. He added that the school has been terribly overcrowded for several years. He felt this was a school that they could take into a better area and not let them drop.

REQUEST FOR EXECUTIVE SESSION

MOTION: Mr. Costa – Mrs. Panchley: For executive session.

A roll call showed:

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

All were in favor

None Opposed

Motion passed (10:17 PM)

Mayor Flanagan asked for the reason for Executive Session.

Attorney Assad: “Mass General Laws, Chapter 30A 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 Helen Sowinski, National Navy Defense Cadet Corp Non Commissioned Officer; Maelynn Clarke, Behaviorist; Timothy McCloskey, Director of Engineering Services; and James Medeiros, Assistant Director of Environmental Services. The Chair has determined that an open session would have a detrimental effect on the collective bargaining. We would reconvene. There may or may not be statements at that time.

At 12:00 AM a roll call was requested by Mayor Flanagan to reconvene:

Mr. Andrade: Present	Mr. Maynard: Present
Mr. Costa: Present	Mrs. Panchley: Present
Mr. Hart: Present	Mayor Flanagan: Present
Mr. Martins: Present	

Mayor Flanagan asked if based upon discussions of Executive Session, there were any motions to be made.

Mr. Costa said there were.

MOTION: Mr. Costa – : To accept the \$4,500 fine for copyright violation for the athletics job description.

No Discussion

All were in favor

None were opposed

Motion approved

MOTION: Mr. Costa – Mr. Hart: To accept the MOU for government programs.

No Discussion

All were in favor

None were opposed

Motion approved

MOTION: Mr. Costa – Mr. Hart: To approve a one year contract with a 1% increase for Mr. Saunders.

No Discussion

A roll call showed:

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

6 were in favor 1 was opposed (Mayor Flanagan) Motion passed

MOTION: Mr. Andrade – Mr. Hart: To accept a contract for \$70,000 for Kim Sihavong.

No Discussion

A roll call showed:

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

4 were in favor 3 were opposed (Mr. Costa/Mrs. Panchley/Mayor Flanagan) Motion passed

MOTION: Mr. Costa – Mr. Hart: To accept the contract as negotiated for Helen Sowinski, National Naval Defense Cadet Corp Non-Commissioned Officer.

No Discussion

All were in favor None were opposed Motion approved

MOTION: Mr. Costa – Mr. Hart: To accept the contract as negotiated with Maelynn Clark, Behaviorist.

No Discussion

All were in favor None were opposed Motion approved

MOTION: Mr. Costa – Mr. Hart: To accept the contract with Timothy McCloskey, Director of Engineering Services, as negotiated.

No Discussion

All were in favor None were opposed Motion approved

MOTION: Mr. Costa – Mr. Hart: To accept the contract as negotiated with James Medeiros, Assistant Director of Environmental Services.

No Discussion

All were in favor None were opposed Motion approved

MOTION: Mr. Costa – : To adjourn.

No Discussion

All were in favor None were opposed Motion approved (12:03 AM)

Respectfully submitted,



Administrative Assistant for
School Committee Services