

REGULAR MEETING OF THE FALL RIVER SCHOOL COMMITTEE

Monday, March 2, 2015

7:30 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 Rene Kochman, Director of Operation and Director of Media for FRED TV; Joseph Correia, Director of Administrative Services; Scott Cabral, Network Technician; and Tom Coogan, Chief Operating Officer.
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

At 7:38 PM, Mayor Sutter called to order the Regular Meeting of the Fall River School Committee for Monday, March 2, 2015 at Morton Middle School. This meeting was rescheduled from February 9, 2015 which was canceled due to a snow storm.

A roll call for attendance showed all members were present.

The Open Meeting Law was read.

A salute to the Flag followed.

CITIZENS INPUT

There were no citizens signed up to speak this evening.

RECOGNITION AWARDS

Superintendent Mayo-Brown said they do have recognitions and Mayor Sutter asked that his colleagues join him on the floor for the presentation.

Mr. Martins called the three nominees – Ms. Brenda Racine, Mr. Brian Raposo, and Mr. David Assad - forward and asked that Ms. Marcia Picard who submitted the nominations read her submission at which point she did. The Committee then presented the awards to each recipient.

SUPERINTENDENT’S REPORT

Superintendent Mayo-Brown said other than a lot of snow, she had no items to report this evening.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

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

No Discussion

All were in favor

None were opposed

Motion passed

TRAVEL REQUESTS

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

No discussion

All were in favor

None were opposed

Motion passed

DONATIONS

MOTION: Mr. Costa – Mr. Hart: To accept all donations as listed.

No discussion

All were in favor

None were opposed

Motion passed

CONTRACTS

MOTION: Mr. Andrade – Mr. Costa: To accept all contracts as listed.

Discussion

Mrs. Panchley requested that the School and Main Institute be held off on until it is discussed later in the agenda. She suggested they bring it back to the table after the discussion.

Mr. Andrade agreed to amend his motion.

AMENDED MOTION: Mr. Andrade – Mr. Costa: To accept all contracts as listed except the School and Main Institute which they would defer until later.

No discussion

All were in favor

None were opposed

Motion passed

GRANTS

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

Discussion

Mr. Martins wished to discuss two of the grants. The first was the Occupational Education-Vocational Skills grant for \$105,446. The grant lists stipends for \$7,500 and he questioned what the stipends were for.

Superintendent Mayo-Brown said she did not see Mr. Gadbois in the audience. Their practice is to have the Grant Directors in the audience to answer questions. She asked to withdraw the Occupation Education Grant and the Financial Literacy Program because she did not see either of those directors in the audience. She apologized to the Committee.

Mr. Martins said the questions he has are:

- What is the purpose of the stipends?
- Who will be receiving the stipends?
- What are they going to do for it?
- The consultants for \$5,000 – who and for what purpose?
- Travel \$11,000 – where and why?
- Membership and Subscriptions - \$6,000 for what organizations and programs?

Mr. Martins felt if students are building something and then having to take it apart when they are finished building it, it can be a very negative thing for students. If they are going into the STEM program then he felt it was a good opportunity, especially in the carpentry program, for the students to design and build things for people such as sheds. He felt the money spent on things such as subscriptions could be better spent on materials to expand the program. He explained that there is a lot of learning that goes on with these projects.

The second grant that is of concern to him is the SPED/21st Century Enhanced. He questioned how much the grant was for because the first page states \$10,000 but when he went through the grant, it stated \$20,000.

Superintendent Mayo-Brown asked that Ms. Siobhan Ryan come forward to answer Mr. Martins' questions regarding the grant.

Ms. Ryan and Ms. Ivone Medeiros came to the podium. Ms. Ryan said that the grant was for \$20,000 which was for special education enhancement funding for Durfee and Morton. She explained that \$10,000 is put aside for the summer program and they will not receive those funds until July 1.

Mr. Martins said that the first page of the grant states \$10,000.

Ms. Ryan responded that that is the fund set up sheet that will be entered into Munis so that is what they have to expend before June 30. The remaining \$10,000 is put aside for summer programming.

Mr. Martins asked if the entire grant was for \$20,000.

Ms. Ryan nodded yes.

Mr. Martins said those are the only grants that he had concerns about and yielded.

Mayor Sutter asked if there was any further discussion and there were none.

All were in favor

None were opposed

Motion passed

Superintendent Mayo-Brown asked Mayor Sutter on behalf of Madame Secretary for clarification if they were withdrawing the Financial Literacy Program and Occupational Education Vocational Skills grants as part of that vote.

Mayor Sutter said yes and everyone was in agreement.

DISCUSSIONS

Mayor Sutter said this brings us to the discussion portion of this evening's agenda.

1. **Vote to Approve:** Election of Vice Chairperson of the Fall River School Committee as detailed in policy BDA to reflect city ordinance.

Mayor Sutter said the first item was the election of the Vice Chairperson of the Fall River School Committee.

He asked the School Committee if they were any nominations.

MOTION: Mrs. Panchley – Mr. Hart: To nominate Mark Costa as Vice-Chair of the Fall River School Committee.

No discussion

Mr. Costa asked for a roll call vote.

A roll call showed:

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

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

Mayor Sutter congratulated Mr. Costa and explained that it was customary for the Vice Chair to address the audience and handed the floor over to the Vice Chair.

Mr. Costa thanked him for the opportunity and thanked his colleagues for their vote to keep him in the position of Vice Chair. It is a position he does not take lightly and he thanked his colleagues for their confidence that he will be able to continue in that capacity. He has witnessed over the years the School Committee make some considerable gains when it comes to setting policy and advocating for budgets that meet the needs of the 10,000 students in the district. It is a position that he has grown into and enjoys the relationship that he has had with previous Mayors he has served with in addition to the Superintendent and her leadership staff. He looks forward to continuing that. He thanked his colleagues again and appreciated their vote of confidence.

Mayor Sutter thanked Mr. Costa.

ADDENDUM: Mayor Sutter said that there was an addendum that he would like to take at this point in the agenda.

MOTION: Mr. Costa – Mr. Maynard: To approve the addendum.		
<u>No Discussion</u>		
All were in favor	None were opposed	Motion passed

MOTION: Mr. Costa – Mr. Hart: To approve the sum of \$3,386,579 appropriation from the general fund to the school department.		
<u>No Discussion</u>		
All were in favor	None were opposed	Motion passed

Mayor Sutter noted that this brought them back to their regular discussion items.

- Vote to Approve:** E-rate projects, *as referred by the Finance Subcommittee and presented by Mr. Tom Coogan, Chief Operating Officer.*

Mayor Sutter asked that Mr. Coogan address the Committee.

Mr. Coogan explained that during the last Finance Subcommittee meeting they brought up this matter for discussion. Earlier in the school year they had a vote before the Committee to approve a series of projects and they were grateful that the Committee approved those projects and funded them. Since that time they have gotten clarification on the new E-rate regulations which were in influx at the time they voted on the projects. There is a way for them to postpone the projects until the following year and move next year’s projects into this school year to swap the two years’ projects. By doing this they are able to leverage five instead of three schools upgrades for the same

amount of money. Coming into this year they would accelerate the VOIP transition program in the schools that were due to be done and the schools that were due to be done next year would be done with the funding that the Committee had approved from the E-rate projects this year.

MOTION: Mr. Costa – Mr. Hart: To approve the E-rate projects.

Discussion

Mr. Martins asked if they were on the page that read “building priority list”.

Mr. Coogan said that was for the capital projects.

Mr. Martins asked if they were given back up information for this agenda item.

Superintendent Mayo-Brown said that there was no handout for this. It came in from a Finance Subcommittee so there was nothing in their packets.

Mr. Coogan explained that they previously approved three schools network upgrade earlier in the year for \$210,000.

Mr. Martins said previously approved.

Mr. Coogan said yes it was previously approved. They would use the \$210,000 for the voice over IP phone upgrades and next year’s money would be used for the E-rate projects. By rotating the two projects, they would get two more schools upgraded out of the package.

Mr. Martins said there were no documents indicating the date it was approved and now they are moving from one year to another year. He found it very difficult to understand the sequence of what transpired.

Mr. Coogan said he could put together a memo if the Committee would prefer and they could table the motion and move it to the next meeting.

Mr. Martins asked where the money was coming from.

Mr. Coogan said it was money that was approved last year.

Mr. Martins asked again where the money was coming from.

Mr. Costa responded E-rate and Mr. Coogan agreed.

Mr. Saunders explained that when the city reappropriated \$911,000 to the school department in November to put them back up to net school spending they came back with a list of projects. Inside those projects was an upgrade of networks for three schools for \$210,000. At the time they did not know about the new regulations that were issued after the fact on E-rate. They re-evaluated the E-rate because of new regulations and realized they can get more for their dollar by taking that \$210,000 by swapping this year’s projects for next year’s. They are notifying them that they are better off doing the voice over this year instead which is a project they had planned for the next year.

Mr. Martins asked if he was expected to remember what transpired this past November.

Mr. Saunders said he asked where the \$210,000 came from and what he gave was an explanation on how they put the money in for the projects. They did it in November when they got the additional \$911,000.

Mr. Martins asked if the \$210,000 had been expended.

Mr. Saunders said absolutely not but they are asking for a vote because the School Committee was notified that they were going to do three schools but they have the opportunity to do five schools instead.

Mr. Martins asked if E-rate came directly into the city.

Mr. Saunders said the projects are eligible for E-rate; there are matching funds. The projects are almost \$1M but they just have to come up with their \$210,000. The portion paid by E-rate is not part of their budget. There is \$210,000 in the budget to do three networks and they are asking to delay the three projects and do the five projects next year and the voice override this year with the \$210,000.

Mr. Martins asked if the \$210,000 is going to remain in escrow somewhere.

Mr. Coogan responded no and explained that essentially what they are going to do is \$210,000 worth of voice over IP phone upgrades at five or six different facilities. By doing the voice override IP conversions this year with that \$210,000, next year's projects would happen in this year and the network upgrades that were supposed to happen this year would happen next year.

Mr. Martins said it is almost like who's on first. He asked if the E-rate money was from 2014.

Mr. Saunders said no and explained that E-rate is the project's eligibility. What they have right now is \$210,000 in their budget to do something with. They told them at the time that the \$210,000 would be used to do three schools because they had old regulations. E-rate had come back and gave them eligibility criteria that allowed them, if they postpone doing the networks now, to get five schools for the \$210,000. They are just E-rate eligible - it is not E-rate funding or anything else.

Mr. Martins said that he understands they have \$210,000 sitting someplace right now and they want to hang onto that \$210,000.

Mr. Saunders said no what they want to do is the voice override this year and then in FY16 there will be a budget for \$210,000 to do the networks which would allow them to do five schools instead of three.

Mr. Martins asked where they were going to get another \$210,000 in FY16.

Mr. Saunders said because they are going to have a budget in FY16 and they are going to put in for those projects. If there is no money next year then that is another thing but they are always looking at the budget as a process.

Mr. Martins asked if they were or were not going to do repairs in FY15.

Mr. Saunders said they are going to do repairs in FY15.

Mr. Martins asked for how much money.

Mr. Coogan responded \$210,000.

Mr. Martins said okay but asked in FY16 how many buildings they were going to repair for that amount.

Mr. Coogan explained that the original plan called for three buildings. When they do an E-rate project they submit a proposal and they have to show their funding for their end of the project. The government then pays for the balance of the project with matching funds. It is not a one for one dollar but about 15% to 17% for the district and the government pays the rest. What they would do is submit projects for a total of five schools for next year which with the new regulations and the new allowances they could get for the same amount of money, for \$210,000. They would use the \$210,000 that the Committee has approved as part of that earlier project list in November to fund a phone project this year on a number of buildings and switch them from conventional phone lines to voice over IP phones. They are swapping an FY15 project for an FY16 project.

Mr. Martins asked if they were going to get double of that amount in matching funds.

Mr. Coogan said that it is more than double. When they do an E-rate project they put up about 15%-17% of the money and the government picks up the other 85%.

Mr. Martins asked if someone from the Finance Subcommittee could add to the conversation because it seemed to be very confusing as to how they are going to expend \$210,000 in FY15.

Mr. Saunders explained that the \$210,000 is the school department's share. There is another 85% that is picked up by the feds directly so they are going to put \$210,000 in next year and get around \$1M investment for those networks.

Mr. Martins said very well but if it does not prove out he will remember the conversation.

Mr. Costa said Mr. Martins had asked someone from finance to add to it. He explained that the administration went to the Committee requesting to use \$210,000 of funding to put towards a project that was essentially going to achieve wiring three schools. After review of that they realized that based on the change in the regulations, with the Committee's vote to appropriate the \$210,000 towards those three projects, they could actually leverage doing five schools. If he gets it correct, they are coming now before the Committee to ask for approval to switch what they originally planned. If they approve it they are going to be able to do two additional schools for the same money.

Mr. Coogan said that was correct and those projects need to be submitted and approved by E-rate.

Mr. Costa agreed and noted that the projects that they originally approved and are swapping, they may have to go back to E-rate in FY16 and resubmit those projects for funding. They are going to budget for those projects and put up the same \$210,000 and hope that E-rate is going to pay the difference which is 85% or 87% depending on how the reimbursement goes. Basically, in doing the

switch it is more for information for the Committee and to get their consent to switch the scope of the project and by doing this they are going to get two additional schools done next year.

Mayor Sutter asked if there was any further discussion and there was none.

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

3. **Vote to Approve:** Three high priority capital projects pending a funding source, *as referred by the Finance Subcommittee and presented by Mr. Tom Coogan, Chief Operating Officer and Mr. Michael Saunders, Chief Financial Officer.*

Mayor Sutter noted this was actually a request to approve four high priority capital projects.

Mr. Coogan said there is a list of projects in the Committee’s binders. At the Facilities Subcommittee meeting and then at the Finance meeting they reviewed a list of capital projects and on that list there are several that are highlighted in red, three on page 1 and one on page 4. There are four projects to be done and was contingent upon the additional monies coming from the city that was just reappropriated to the budget. They went over a list of projects that totaled well over \$1M but they selected four projects as high priority items.

- A rooftop unit at Henry Lord that is budgeted at just over \$95,000 as estimated by their heating contractor that would have to go out to bid;
- There are a series of electric heaters at Durfee High School that would need to be replaced for \$23,000. They have had two fail this winter and have a total of 10 with basically the same end of life cycle;
- The pool filter has been patched, repaired, and reconditioned and has gone about as far as they can take it. The estimate to replace that is \$30,000;
- An air-conditioning system unit on the roof of the Viveiros School that has two motors to it. One of those motors has failed and it is running on one motor right now . The estimate to replace that motor is \$35,000.

When they went through the list it was approximately \$190,000-\$200,000 for those four items. They suggested that those take place first if they were to come across the extra money that was just reappropriated to the system.

Mayor asked if there was a motion to approve.

MOTION: Mr. Costa – Mr. Hart: To approve the four high priority capital projects.

Discussion

Mr. Martins said collectively all the projects come out to \$1.3M.

Mr. Coogan said that was for all of the items on the capital projects list.

Mr. Martins said that is capital costs to do it all at once. Certain items are in red and he asked where the money was going to come from if they consider them as capital costs.

Mr. Saunders said that he believes the intent is the \$3.3 million that was just added into the budget. He thought the projects already went through the Facilities and Finance Subcommittees and would

be high priority projects that would come out of the operating budget. They would be expenses that would go against their net school spending number.

Mr. Martins asked again if they would or would not go towards net school spending.

Mr. Saunders said they would go toward net school spending.

Mr. Martins said when he went through it, it was not clear to him. He found that the pool at Durfee for \$30,000 is a net school spending repair. The replacing of electric heaters for \$23,000 is another net school spending repair. The rooftop unit at Henry Lord would be a capital cost at \$100,000.

Mr. Saunders disagreed and explained that would be a repair that would be going under net school spending.

Mr. Martins responded that capital costs are not part of net school spending.

Mr. Saunders said projects over \$150,000 would not be eligible for net school spending unless the School Committee requested waivers.

Mr. Martins said that was collective.

Mr. Saunders responded no, each project stands by itself. He explained that last year they did two projects that they took at the end of the fiscal year that the School Committee approved after they were done. Both of them were over the amount of money but they were net school eligible because the School Committee decided to put that into their appropriation. That is what they are doing here with the \$100,000 vote by the School Committee, the intent is that would go under repair and it would be net school eligible.

Mr. Martins said he thought it was collective and when doing all the projects at once, made it a capital cost item over \$150,000.

Mr. Saunders said it is by project and School Committee approved.

Mr. Martins said the \$30,000 is net school spending allowed; the \$23,000 is net school spending allowed; the \$100,000 he is being told is net school spending allowed.

Mr. Saunders said because it is under the \$150,000.

Mr. Martins asked if the chiller compressor for \$35,000 is net school spending allowed.

Mr. Saunders that was correct.

Mr. Martins said okay but collectively that goes over \$150,000. They are telling him that that does not matter with the net school spending.

Mr. Saunders said he wanted them to know that when he put it before the Facilities and Finance Subcommittees he also provided the list to DESE for a review to let them know that is where they were headed and their intent. He wanted to be able to say to the School Committee that if they

chose to do these projects they would be eligible for net school spending and that was okay by DESE.

Mr. Martins said with all due respect to any subcommittee, especially when it comes to dollars, if he has questions he is going to ask them. He is not going to let it dictate his vote simply say because three members of the School Committee on a subcommittee said this is what it is going to be. He wants to have the answers, which is why he is asking the questions.

Mr. Saunders said he did not want him to misunderstand. When he said it went between the subcommittees, anticipating that it would go before the School Committee as a whole, he wanted to get approval by DESE so that when he did ask that question, he could answer it. It was not that he was doing it for the subcommittees but so that he could answer that the items would be eligible.

Mr. Martins said they are on the same page that those items are net school spending eligible.

Mr. Saunders said if they choose to as a School Committee - they must approve.

Mr. Martins said okay and he is sure that they will do that and that will be part of net school spending.

Mr. Maynard asked if all the projects would be going out to bid.

Mr. Coogan responded that the electric heaters are under the \$25,000 requirement but they would go out to bid. They will get quotes on all of the projects but the requirement to go out for RFP is \$25,000 on a capital type project and \$35,000 on goods and services.

Mrs. Panchley said she knows that they have had problems with the pool over the recent years and asked if when they do this project if it would be all set.

Mr. Coogan responded that this was one of the items that was in the downstairs mechanical room down below the pool. Several of the items in that room have been replaced over the last several years and this is one of the final pieces within that room. It is another part of the puzzle with the pool but it is a key piece that they have done a lot of repairs to and this would completely replace it.

Mayor Sutter asked if there was any further discussion and there was none.

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

4. **Discussion:** Healthcare and Net School Spending update, *as referred by the Finance Subcommittee and presented by Mr. Michael Saunders, Chief Financial Officer.*

Mr. Saunders said the handout in front of them was dated on January 28, 2015. Based on what happened to them in FY14 they continue to experience claims being paid below the targeted amount. They are not hitting the targeted amount for medical costs so there is a possibility that unless money is reappropriated to the School Committee in FY15 by the end of the year, they will not hit net school spending in the current year. This paper was done before the \$3.3M appropriation was done. At the time if that appropriation was not done they were going to be at 96.5%. Right now they are at 99.1% based on the forecast that they have. This means that there is a \$1.1M issue of savings in the medical plan and because of the fiscal times budgeting at 100%;

anytime there is a savings they fall below net school spending. This is to keep them advised and the city administration and finance staff has also been notified about the possibility that they will not hit net school spending in FY15 because of the medical costs.

Mr. Costa said he knew it was a matter of practice during the last budget preparation discussions that not only the Finance Subcommittee was conducting but also the city in its preparation for this year's fiscal budget. He asked through the Superintendent that those meetings continue to happen like they did last year. One of the reasons why they did send notice to the city was that in going through a similar scenario last fiscal year where they were back-and-forth about whether or not they were going to meet and what that shortfall would be. It carried on for months only to end with them falling short by about \$3.3M. He asked that as they go through the process that they continue to keep the lines of communication open with the city's financial team specifically regarding the health insurance. Traditionally there are two areas which cause them to fall below net school spending and health insurance is one of them because they go on a projection. If they don't meet those targets when the actuals come in then there is a gap there. The sooner they know about that gap and can plan to close that gap, the better off they will be. They know as budgets go and expenditures are made that they have less resources to make up the difference if they get too far into the fiscal year. He asked through the Superintendent that those meetings continue to occur and that if the city has any issues regarding the district's numbers, they sit down and compare their numbers so that they are on the same page.

Mr. Costa continued that the last update was around \$1.1M that they are off in terms of projections and actuals but if they start to see that number increasing as they go down the stretch, he thinks it is cause for further conversation on how they can mitigate that so they are not left at the end of the fiscal year scrambling for resources to try to close that gap. They do not want to be going into next fiscal year talking about shortfall in net school spending in this current fiscal year. He knows those conversations occurred last year and they all learned a valuable lesson through that process. He continued discussion on the projections versus the actuals and how that affects net school spending.

Mr. Costa said he spoke briefly with the Mayor regarding net school spending. He thinks the hope or intention would be eventually to become a community that can expend above and beyond what is minimally required. Until they get to that point, he thinks having frank discussions about meeting 100% of what is required is a stance he will continue to hold true to. That is what the statute calls for and what the money is intended for and the students deserve to have that funding. He requested again that the line of communications remain open. The more they can communicate with their colleagues on the city side and City Council the better off they will be.

Mr. Costa concluded by thanking Mayor Sutter for the appropriation and holding true to his commitment for that funding to be requested by the Council. He also thanked the City Council who have been extremely supportive year after year of making sure that the school department gets the funding to meet its required net school spending. He knows the School Committee takes a firm stance on 100% of net school spending with the cooperation of the Council and Mayor Sutter and hoped it did not become a reoccurring topic as they start to prepare for FY16.

Mrs. Panchley said Mr. Costa had alluded to it but she wanted to confirm that the City Council was notified after their last Finance Subcommittee meeting of the status of the projections of the health insurance savings.

Mr. Saunders said they took it up at their last Council meeting.

Mrs. Panchley asked if this was a conservative estimate as far as Mr. Saunders was concerned.

Mr. Saunders said yes and they have had communications to let them know.

Mrs. Panchley said it was a month ago that this was prepared for the February meeting and she wanted to echo Mr. Costa's sentiments. Last year was her first year on the School Committee and chairing the Finance Subcommittee and it was a difficult budget. She appreciated the Mayor and the City Council coming through with the appropriation and making things the way they should be.

Mr. Martins asked if they budgeted a certain amount of money for healthcare.

Mr. Saunders said that was correct.

Mr. Martins said it did not cost that amount of money and asked if he was correct.

Mr. Saunders said they budgeted for but their rate of expense says they will not hit that amount so it is correct.

Mr. Martins said that money is not a surplus or a savings and has to be expended elsewhere in the budget on a net school spending line in order to maintain net school spending. He asked if that was correct.

Mr. Saunders said that was correct and let them know that all communications they have had with the finance team; everybody understands that this net school spending money would have to come back just like the \$3.3M came back in the current year. If they do not hit the amounts targeted then that money should come back into education.

Mr. Martins said he did not understand the big discussion of why if the cost of insurance is decreasing and they budgeted high but the actual cost of health insurance is down then the difference is to be expended elsewhere. He suggested they hire more teachers with it.

Mr. Saunders said he wanted them to know from the communications that they have had that everybody knows that if there is a savings on medical costs for schools it has to be returned to the schools for net school spending. He thought that was the positive part of last year's budget and is understood by everybody.

Mr. Martins asked how much that amount was.

Mr. Saunders said they are projecting right now about \$1.1M.

Mr. Martins asked if they had received that amount of money.

Mr. Saunders said they are notifying the people that they are not hitting that target. They have not requested nor have they offered to give them that money yet.

Mr. Martins asked if they were going to request that money.

Mr. Saunders said eventually they will get to the point where they will have discussions with the finance team and the administration. He added that everybody knows that FY15 would not hit net

school spending unless they take some kind of course of action. The people they have talked to all know there has to be some sort of course of action taken.

Mr. Martins said this could apply to any item of net school spending. Each line has a particular purpose and if any particular line is not expended to that amount then it has to be transferred to some other line to be able to be expended to meet net school spending. In this case it happens to be health costs.

Mr. Saunders replied that was correct.

Mr. Martins said he did not understand why there is a big issue. If they did not expend the money then the difference has to be transferred into net school spending.

Mr. Saunders said the positive thing with the conversations that they have had is that everybody knows there is going to be a shortfall.

Mr. Martins said the issue of the city versus school department has been going on for quite some time and asked if it was possible that the school department handle the healthcare for school department employees and the city handle the healthcare for city employees.

Mr. Saunders said he did not think they were at the point. He knows that the new administration would like them to have the healthcare inside of their budget but right now they budget for a certain amount and the healthcare is paid for on the city side. The city has had conversations suggesting they appropriate the entire amount to the school department.

Mr. Martins said what he is saying is that the \$1.1M that Mr. Saunders has put down isn't agreed to by the city's financial team.

Mr. Saunders said that when he gave the city's finance team the \$1.1M figure, they gave him \$800,000. They all know there is a shortfall but will not know the exact number until June 30. They do know they are in the same vicinity.

Mr. Martins said it seems to him that if they know how many employees they have and who is on medical costs then it should be able to be calculated out.

Mr. Saunders explained they have over 1,400 full-time employees and go through employees on a rotating basis. They are also becoming single and married as they go along and change things. He noted that when someone comes up with \$1.1M and someone comes up with \$800,000 out of a \$22M budget line, they know everybody is at the same point. The exact number changes but they are on top of it and calculated every month.

Mr. Martins asked when they were going to get together and come up with an agreeable figure.

Mr. Saunders replied that last year it took the June 30 end-of-year report and numerous determinations by DESE to determine the number. He is telling them a projection now and that based on where they are at they are going to have a savings inside of healthcare that would have to be addressed in the next four months.

Mr. Martins recommended to the Chair that he lean on the city's financial team and the school department's financial team to have them come to a conclusion. There has got to be a solution to it.

Mayor Sutter clarified for the public that it is the opposite of what the Governor means when he says there is a \$1.5 billion shortfall. That is overspending. In this case, there has actually been under spending which is technically not a shortfall. They have an additional \$1.1M that they did not anticipate and are not going to meet the ultimate net school spending amount. He asked if that was correct in that Mr. Saunders was not using shortfall the way Governor Baker uses shortfall.

Mr. Saunders said he is definitely not.

Mayor Sutter reiterated that he just wanted the public to understand that it is under spending because of an over projection. Whether or not they can do anything about that remains to be seen when they consider that in order to meet the \$3.3M, they had to deplete their stabilization account and are now left with only \$500,000.

Mr. Andrade said another point to make clear is they may find it difficult to understand why there is such disagreement on the actual deficit in healthcare and that is simply because it is based on the claims that are made against the insurance which could be right up until June 30. Therefore, they look at a projection in what has been spent up until now and projecting based on that as to what the deficit is going to be at the end of the year. It is an estimate just like they would estimate how much they are going to be spending to heat the buildings. He thought the key is to have the financial teams work very closely to get it as close as possible.

Mr. Saunders said healthcare everywhere is under pressure to reduce costs and they have had that going on for the last four years. They have had negotiations, changes in the health plans, and they are still looking at those health plans. When the actuaries actually do a cost estimate of what the health plan is going to do they are conservative. They are getting bigger savings out of their health plans than what was anticipated and he thought the trend would continue. The good thing about that is that savings are being generated and can go into something else in education.

Mayor Sutter asked if there was any further discussion and there was none.

5. **Vote to Approve:** Superintendent's goals, *as presented by Superintendent Mayo-Brown.*

MOTION: Mrs. Panchely – Mr. Hart: To approve the Superintendent's goals as presented.

Discussion

Mr. Martins said that the Superintendent's goals are predicated upon what is referred to as PPI which is Pupil Progress Indicator and a measure of student growth but yet the goal is to lower the achievement gap and that is CPI or Composite Proficiency Index of the various categories by 50% using the 2011 data. The Superintendent and he disagree on what the goal is to be achieved by 2017. He thought it was important to ask the Department of Education what the goal that schools are to be measured by 2017 will be. He noted that a few years ago there was measure called Annual Progress Report which was done away with in favor of PPI. PPI is a rate of progress and not the goal itself. CPI is the goal itself.

He continued that the evaluation of the Superintendent was based on PPI but if they look at it the first goal says that by September 2015 each district school that met their 2014 annual progress and performance target will sustain their target. He named the eight schools and said to him it is not much of a goal because it would be expected that they would be achieving that and should not evaluate someone on the basis of “just keep doing what you're doing and we are okay”. The second part of the measure is that schools that improve below the target will meet their annual 2014 PPI target. He explained that the PPI target is self-determined and not determined by the Department of Education unless they use the 75 but the goal is set at 50. That is the local goal and not the state goal.

Mr. Martins continued with his thoughts on how the goal was written. He suggested a motion to request from the Department of Education a written statement regarding what the goal of 2017 is.

Mr. Andrade noted that there was already a motion on the table.

Mayor Sutter asked if there was any further discussion.

Mr. Andrade said that they do have a motion on the table so the motion cannot be made at this particular time. He has difficulty with using the score from a single test on a single day to evaluate anybody; however, if Mr. Martins were to make his motion following the motion on the table he would second it because this has been in contention for some time. He thought they should get a definitive ruling from DESE to lay the issue to rest once and for all.

Mayor Sutter asked if there was any further discussion on the motion concerning the Superintendent's goals.

Mrs. Panchley said that she wished they could have a conversation at this point because she was a little confused. She asked if they were saying they would wait on the first one and it was determined they would not. She said okay because she agrees with the PPI - the growth and the performance - and she also wanted straighten out that her understanding reading the goal is that the five schools that improved below their target will meet their annual PPI which did not mean their “made up” annual PPI but that they will get to 75. She thought Mr. Martins was interpreting that the Superintendent was letting those five schools come up with any number for their target but there target is 75. The eight schools that were over 75 are being asked to stay at the number over 75 at the number they reached last year. The state wants them to be at 75 and they have eight schools that are doing better than that and they are just asking them to stay above where they are. The five that were close in most respects, they want them to get to the 75 where the state wants them. That leaves two schools that were really not close and they are asking them to get to 50 this year. She thought it was appropriate and agreed with that goal as written. She thought most of the goals seem to be a compilation of what many of the members submitted. She thought there was a nice variety this year and the goals were better than the goals from last year.

Mr. Costa said he agreed with Mr. Andrade that they have had the discussion a number of times regarding what the measure is and will support the motion if it is made as to an inquiry as to what the state is going to rely on in terms of whether or not they are making progress. To speak to the motion on the floor, his understanding is that if they continue to meet PPI in the district, PPI is a component of CPI so if they continue to make progress they are in a sense going to effectuate that goal that needs to be met by 2017. He asked if that was correct.

Superintendent Mayo-Brown said that was correct and clarified that PPI stands for Progress and Performance Index. The performance is the CPI and is the most heavily weighted component of PPI. The progress of Progress and Performance is student growth. In essence PPI is the state's accountability formula for all schools in all districts in the Commonwealth. Every year the state sets the target of 75. If they hit 75 - which is a combination of CPI as well as student growth and for the high school it includes graduation rate - the state feels that they are making progress.

Mr. Costa asked towards the goal of 2017.

Superintendent Mayo-Brown said yes toward the goal of 2017. She added that this came up in a subcommittee meeting regarding CPI and agreed that the state had submitted to the federal government a formula of reducing the achievement gap by 50% by 2017. What Mr. Martins says is correct that CPI is part of the federal government's accountability for the state. She told them that the state is currently working with superintendents and other stakeholders because they are not going to meet that goal and they are in the process of filing another flexibility waiver. There is going to be something brand-new submitted. What the state had put into place for 2017 by reducing that gap, they are taking a look at it and are going to submit something else. That is going to continually change.

Superintendent Mayo-Brown continued that Mr. Martins pointed out that they used to have AYP which stands for Adequate Yearly Progress which got converted to PPI through the federal government and now she believes they are going to see something new. PPI is the state's accountability for districts and schools. They want to heavily weight CPI in that formula and slightly weight student growth in that formula. She added that Mr. Costa was right, if they are hitting that target they are making progress in absolute performance which is CPI.

Mr. Costa said by setting these goals and using PPI they are capturing not only achievement but also progress.

Superintendent Mayo-Brown said that was correct; they are capturing progress and performance.

Mr. Andrade said that he is in full agreement with Mrs. Panchley in terms of the quality of the goals. He thinks it's a good spread and he particularly likes the last two.

Mr. Martins asked to show an example by taking one of the highest rated schools in the district which is the Silvia School whose PPI is 105. When they look at the CPI for English language arts the baseline was 81 in 2011 and in 2014 they achieved 83.3. Their target for 2014, which would be the goal, is 85.8. Even though they are one of the highest schools they did not achieve the CPI target and it says they improved below target. He felt they have to come up with what they are looking for in 2017.

Mr. Martins asked if the maker of the motion would reconsider. They have another meeting coming up on the 16th and if they could get the answer from the Department of Education between now and the 16th it would be helpful and would not delay the process of approving the Superintendent's evaluation.

Mayor Sutter asked if the maker of the motion wanted to reconsider and Mrs. Panchley said she would not.

A roll call showed:

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

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

MOTION: Mr. Martins – Mr. Andrade: To ask the Department of Education to submit in writing what the actual goal is to be achieved for 2017. Is it the reduction of CPI by the achievement gap for the various levels or is it achieving a certain amount of PPI or is it some combination of both so that we know exactly what we are going to face come 2017.

Discussion

Superintendent Mayo-Brown responded that Mr. Martins was absolutely correct. They could request it in writing from the Department. The State’s goal with the Federal Government is that the State will reduce the achievement gap by 50%. There is no argument about that. The State’s accountability model is PPI. The question as she understands it is that he would like to hold her to one measure that is absolute performance, CPI. She does not think there is any debate or argument with the State whether that is the goal or not; that is the goal. The State’s accountability structure for all districts and all schools in the State is PPI. Her question for the Committee who voted on PPI is do they hold someone accountable for absolute performance, strictly CPI or do they hold someone accountable for the accountability system that the State has put in place.

Mr. Martins said he would compromise by calling as far as the composite using all students and not necessarily all of the individual groups because in order to achieve the composite they have to get all of the subgroups to come up. Likewise he felt what she was saying is that she wants to be evaluated on eight schools that are already above the target and all they have to do is maintain that level. If they maintain the level she is a superstar. Those five schools that have selected a target of 50 are already at 50 or above. PPI is a self-determined goal and she put the goal at 50 for these schools.

Superintendent Mayo-Brown said he is implying that the performance of schools is static and all they have to do is maintain. Those targets move from year-to-year. In order to hit 75 and get the points for hitting the target, it is a trajectory of progress. In order to hit that 75 schools are on a trajectory and CPI has to move in that formula.

Mr. Martins said it is obviously a little more difficult than the example he cited. They have to work at achieving what they have already achieved to keep it.

Superintendent Mayo-Brown asked him to knowledge “and more”; that they have to keep what they have achieved and more to do it again the next year.

Mr. Martins said that that is not where her goal says.

Superintendent Mayo-Brown said it absolutely is because that target moves and he knows that that target moves for schools. She is saying that they have to continue to hit their target. If they have hit their target already, they have to continue to hit it and it is a moving target for the schools.

Superintendent Mayo-Brown added that she wanted to get the point out if they are going to just solely focus on CPI which is the number of students who are proficient in math, English language arts, and science. She asked if he could imagine what that message sends to teachers – that the only thing that matters in this district is not how hard they are working and how hard they can demonstrate student progress, but it is all about performance and it is all about the test. She cannot do that for him and will not send that message to their teachers.

Mr. Martins said he disagrees in that they are still bringing all students up. They will not achieve 50% CPI without bringing all of the students up. They are going to have to have growth within it but the goal is to achieve 50%.

Superintendent Mayo-Brown said that the goal is as he describes it is all about the MCAS test. That is what he wants to evaluate her on; how well their students perform on the MCAS test because CPI is all about getting the number of students on proficiency. She prefers – as she has met with School Committee members and through their conversations and what was submitted in writing – it is a comprehensive approach. They are acknowledging the progress that their students are making with their teachers, acknowledging absolute performance, and acknowledging reductions in the drop-out rate as part of Durfee's PPI. It is a more holistic view in what their educators are doing day to day. CPI sends the message that it is all about the test and it is all about the number of kids you get to proficient.

Mr. Martins said there are a whole bunch of measures that go into PPI and that is where they get their points from.

Superintendent Mayo-Brown said that was correct but Mr. Martins does not want PPI; he wants CPI and CPI is all about MCAS.

Mr. Martins said they are going to go round and round in circles. He believes the motion was approved to ask the Department of Education to rent to a written determination as to what is going to be expected of school districts come June 30, 2017.

Mayor Sutter said the motion was made and seconded but not approved yet. They are just in the middle of discussion.

Mr. Martins said it needs to be obtained by the next School Committee meeting which is on March 16. If the Department of Education says is going to be measured on growth, then fine. If they say it is going to be measured on composite performance index, fine. If it is going to be measured as some relationship between the two, fine. At least he knows what the game is to be played and right now he does not.

Mrs. Panchley said they just voted seven yes that this is the goal for the Superintendent this year; that they are using PPI as the goal. She has no problem if they want to get something in writing describing CPI and PPI and what the Federal Government wants and what the State expects. She does not have a problem with that except she thinks voting on this goal should put an end to the conversation for this year of CPI versus PPI. When the Committee makes a vote then she feels that is it and does not feel like they should be talking about this now meeting after meeting. If people disagree that PPI was the measure to evaluate the Superintendent on then they should have voted no for the goals. But they all voted yes and she believes that should be the end of it.

Mr. Maynard said he feels the same as Mrs. Panchley. These are the goals and he is satisfied with them. They voted for the goals so that should be the end of it.

No further discussion.

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

6. **Vote to Approve:** Additional coaching staff for BMC Durfee High School: assistant baseball coach and assistant softball coach for a total of 2 additional coaching stipends.

MOTION: Mr. Costa – Mr. Hart: To approve the additional coaching staff for Durfee High School.

Discussion

Mr. Maynard asked what the cost would be for the two coaches.

Superintendent Mayo-Brown said for each coach she is recommending the cost is \$3,834 as the assistant coach stipend is listed in the FREA contract for coaches.

Mr. Maynard asked why they needed two more coaches.

Superintendent Mayo-Brown said she detailed in a brief to the School Committee that baseball and softball are the only sports where they have three games occurring at the same time. That was brought to her attention. She explained that they have a varsity game, junior varsity, and freshmen game all going on at the same time at different locations. Right now they have a head coach, an assistant coach, and another assistant coach for varsity. She is recommending a fourth for both softball and baseball so that they have the additional coach to provide additional supervision particularly when they are offsite.

Mr. Martins asked how many students are in each of the sports.

Superintendent Mayo-Brown said she would have to confirm but believed there was between 16 and 18 players.

Mr. Martins asked what the staffing was in previous years and if it was the same number they already have.

Mayor Sutter clarified that that was 16 to 18 players per team for three teams.

Mr. Martins said he understood that but for the past three years they have dealt with the same problem and it has worked out. He asked why they needed to have another coach.

Superintendent Mayo-Brown said that she understands his opinion is that if it's worked before let's just keep it the same but the recommendation she is making increases one coach for softball and one for baseball based on what she feels are the supervisory needs. She was not aware that they had the three teams playing at the same time, the same day, often at different locations. If a player was injured off-site she questioned who would go with that student-athlete and who would remain behind with the team. It was a matter of supervision.

Mayor Sutter asked if in the past they have had three coaches for three baseball teams and three coaches for three softball teams and the proposal is to have four for three teams in each sport. Superintendent Mayo-Brown said that was correct.

Mr. Andrade said he is sure that the instance she cited has happened before and asked how it has been handled.

Superintendent Mayo-Brown said if the student's parent is there it is an option and if not that is the very question; who goes with the student and who stays behind and are they sure the person who is supervising has gone through the CORI process. For her it was an additional measure of safety and security for their students.

Mr. Andrade asked how the extra person would be utilized.

Superintendent Mayo-Brown said that was at the head coach's discretion. For example, if they had a home game at Durfee they would have a team on the JV field and a team on the varsity field and the freshmen team would be away. She assumed the head coach would send them with the freshmen so they have two people off site and two coaches on the Durfee fields but would leave it to the head coach's discretion.

Mr. Maynard said he would vote for the two extra coaches just for safety reasons.

Mr. Martins asked if there is an athletic trainer that accompanies baseball and softball.

Superintendent Mayo-Brown said they have an athletic trainer.

Mr. Martins asked if the athletic trainer also goes.

Superintendent Mayo-Brown said no and explained that the athletic trainer does not always travel with the team. Her understanding is that the athletic trainer is at Durfee for games. The athletic trainer covers all sports in all seasons on-site.

Mr. Costa added that the home team provides the trainer on-site. If they were to go to New Bedford, for instance, New Bedford would have a trainer there and our trainer stays home for home games to tend to the opponents team as well.

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

7. **Report:** Progress of the Committee addressing its goals, *as presented by Mr. Gabriel Andrade, Evaluation/AIP Subcommittee Chair.*

Mr. Andrade said he would like to defer most of this to the next meeting because the Subcommittee has not met. He was hoping to meet with them prior to the next meeting; however, there was one item that he would like to speak to. One of the items they would be discussing would be adding some benchmarks to the Superintendent's goals so that they can figure out exactly how they are going to evaluate her based on what activities. If any member of the Committee would like to submit anything to them they could do that through Mrs. Caron or e-mail him. He welcomes any thoughts on that.

8. **Vote to Approve:** January’s monthly expense report, *as presented by Mr. Michael Saunders, Chief Financial Officer.*

MOTION: Mr. Costa – Mr. Hart: To approve January’s monthly expense report.

Discussion

Mr. Martins asked that Mr. Saunders come forward and questioned if the actual expenditure in building rentals and lease in FY14 was \$128,000.

Mr. Saunders said that was correct.

Mr. Martins responded that for FY15 they only appropriated \$64,000.

Mr. Saunders said that was correct and explained that that was the temporary Resiliency Middle School that they located downtown.

Mr. Martins asked if it was the old Cherry & Webb building.

Mr. Saunders replied yes.

Mr. Martins asked on contracted services if they are projected to go over the budgeted amount by \$280,000.

Mr. Saunders said that was correct and explained they are actually over in that line item. The next item is the second quarter transfer and he will see that there is \$375,000 being transferred to that.

Mr. Martins said he understands that and will ask a question about that when they get to it. He then asked about the Medicare program which in FY14 was \$42,000 and FY15 slightly above \$42,000 but they have a percentage used of zero and he sees that they expended \$8,000. He asked if that was an error.

Mr. Saunders said he believes that is an error in the calculation on the percentage. He will look at that Excel spreadsheet.

Mr. Martins clarified that it was not at 0%.

Mr. Saunders said that was correct.

All were in favor None were opposed Motion passed

9. **Vote to Approve:** The second quarter budget transfers, *as presented by Mr. Michael Saunders, Chief Financial Officer.*

MOTION: Mr. Maynard – Mrs. Panchley: To approve the second quarter budget transfers.

Discussion

Mr. Martins said they are asking to transfer \$375,000 out of teachers' salaries and the explanation is because of special education position vacancies.

Mr. Saunders said there are vacancies and turnover.

Mr. Martins asked if they are teacher vacancies that have not been filled.

Mr. Saunders said the ones they are talking about there are specifically inside of special education. He said that Mr. Costa had asked a question about where they were at and they have identified them in the Boys Club program, the speech program where they have had difficulty recruiting, and in their itinerants.

Mr. Martins said they are taking it out of teachers' salaries and special education teachers are included in that.

Mr. Saunders explained that they are covering contracts that they let out for special education services for specifically speech. They had speech positions inside the budget and some other positions that were not filled or not needed because they couldn't find anyone so they contracted.

Mr. Martins said he understood that but just wanted to make sure that they are taking out of teachers' salaries because there are vacant positions that have not been filled.

Mr. Saunders said they have not been filled.

Mr. Martins said they are putting them into contracted services so that IEPs are adhered to.

Mr. Saunders said that was correct.

Mr. Martins said he just wanted to make sure that that is where that money is going. Contracted services is a big catchall. That money is to contract people to make sure that the students' IEPs are being adhered to.

Mr. Saunders said that was correct.

Mr. Martins asked for an itemized breakdown of the line item for contracted services.

Mr. Hart asked Mr. Saunders what the teacher vacancies were.

Mr. Saunders said it was made up of a number of positions and listed a few. When he talks about vacancies and turnover rates; if they have someone retire they hire someone at a lower rate but also in that time they do not have anyone in that position so it generates savings. They might have savings because they don't have that person on board but they still have to provide services so they are contracting out to actually provide those services to meet the IEPs.

Mr. Hart said he understands the contracted services and just wanted to know the vacancies for the teachers. He asked if currently right now that \$375,000 consists of vacant positions that just are not filled yet and they are using the money to fill the contracted services line item.

Mr. Saunders said that is correct.

Mr. Costa asked Mr. Saunders to clarify for the public that these are not positions that were built into the budget as a means to create additional revenues for the district. These were needed positions that the district was unable to fill so now they are shifting the funds that were appropriated for those positions that they cannot find someone who fits the criteria to fill those positions and they now need to contract for those services because services need to be provided.

Mr. Saunders said that is correct.

Mr. Costa just wanted to make sure the public is clear that these are needed positions that were budgeted for and when they went out to hire individuals for these very specific positions that have certain specialties such as speech they could not find individuals who had the correct credentials to fill these speech positions; therefore, they are transferring the monies that were in a professional line item to a contracted services line item so that they can pay for those services.

Mr. Saunders said that was correct.

Mr. Costa said again that he just wanted the public to be clear that the school department is not building vacant positions into a budget as a means to create additional revenues. These are needed positions that they intended on putting people in and if they do find somebody they will then be making a transfer from contracted services back into professional salaries to pay for the individuals.

Mr. Saunders said that is what he was going to say, that these positions right now they cannot find anyone but they are recruiting and if they hire people they would reduce the contracted services.

Mr. Maynard asked where the positions are being advertised.

Mr. Saunders said they advertise on the website under the employment screen and they have also advertised in Boston papers, etc. They are always actively searching for speech therapists.

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

10. **Vote to Approve:** The second quarter revolving fund, *as presented by Mr. Michael Saunders, Chief Financial Officer.*

MOTION: Mr. Costa – Mr. Hart: To approve the second quarter revolving fund.

Discussion

Mr. Martins said the last item on that is the sped circuit breaker and asked where that money went. Right now it is in the revolving account.

Mr. Saunders explained that all receipts for circuit breaker money go through the revolving account. They use the revolving fund to pay for tuitions for out of district students.

Mr. Martins asked why that money is not transferred into the budget for exactly that, tuition.

Mr. Saunders responded because they are required by the state to keep the circuit breaker money separate from the operating money and they have always kept it in the revolving fund.

Mr. Martins asked when they are reporting tuition at the end of the year if they are reporting tuition that is from the budget or from the budget plus the circuit breaker.

Mr. Saunders responded when they end-of-year report, they report all resources under education and how they are expended. All grants and operating money. It is a full report. Inside of that report there is an operating side, revolving funds, and grants. They report all expenses to the state and separate out how much tuition was paid for circuit breaker and how much was paid out of operating.

Mr. Martins asked if the tuition for special education students is a net school spending item.

Mr. Saunders said yes.

Mr. Martins asked if the sum total of circuit breaker money plus the budget money would be applied as a net school spending amount.

Mr. Saunders said it would not. What is applied is all the tuition costs that go into a report that they produce at the end of the year to get eligible for circuit breaker expenses. He believes it is now over \$40,000. They have an unusual tuition and that is where the circuit breaker comes in to give the local community relief for those expenses up and above. They report all their tuitions on that and then they are entitled to some type of circuit breaker money back based on their limits and then a percentage because it has never been 100% funded.

Mr. Martins said he understands what the principle of the circuit breaker is. They have expended "x" number of dollars and because they expended so much they get some money back under the name circuit breaker which in turn they take that money and pay for the tuition. Therefore, they have paid budget money for tuition plus what was given to them as circuit breaker for tuition. Both are for tuition.

Mr. Saunders said that was correct.

Mr. Martins questioned that they could not count that as net school spending.

Mr. Saunders said that is correct.

Mr. Martins found that interesting.

Mr. Costa explained it was because it would get counted twice.

Mr. Saunders agreed and said it is coming back as relief.

Mr. Costa said that was correct; they can't use it towards net school spending because they would be counting it twice.

Mr. Saunders said it is also restricted in that anything in circuit breaker can only be used for tuition and there is only a certain amount that they can have.

Mr. Costa said they are getting credit for the tuition they are spending. If they count the reimbursement that is coming back they are counting it twice. What they spent and what they have been reimbursed. Net school spending can only account for what was expended.

Mr. Saunders said that was correct.

Mr. Martins said he can understand that.

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

11. **Vote to Approve:** School and Main Institute proposal for FRPS Parent Academy Development, *as recommended by Superintendent Mayo-Brown.*

MOTION: Mr. Hart – Mr. Andrade: To approve the School and Main Institute proposal for FRPS Parent Academy Development.

Discussion

Mr. Martins said this has been on the agenda for the past couple of months and has bothered him. He noted that \$40,632 would be paid for School and Main Institute to develop a parental involvement program for implementation in September 2015. He said he had several questions but asked at what point in time is it left to the Committee to implement the program.

Superintendent Mayo-Brown reminded everyone that the agenda item came up in January and they had Andy Beck there who made the presentation from the organization. School and Main has been working closely with the Springfield Public Schools and the goal of the work is to convene all of the stakeholders in the city including School Committee members to do two things. One is to determine what they want Parent Academies to look like in terms of content and delivery and then what assets they have in the community to deliver those parent academies.

Superintendent Mayo-Brown said for example she had met with a bank on Friday and they would like to get involved and offer financial literacy courses to parents at no charge. It is to do that kind of assessment to see what kind of resources they have in the city, how they can best pull those resources together in a way to deliver Parent Academies across the district or in specific schools. With the approval of the contract there would be a convening at Bristol Community College on March 26 at 9:30 AM. They were able to get it on the Mayor's calendar to kick it off and hope that School Committee is able to attend along with many other stakeholders to start this planning process.

Mr. Martins said he is sure that this organization is going to do what they said they were going to do and what she just reiterated is what was told to them. His concern was once it is in place will the organization stay on as a consultant and what would the fee be.

Superintendent Mayo-Brown said their role is outlined in their MOA that is in the School Committee's binders. Phase 1 is the planning that she described and they really detail the work out through June. They bill themselves as capacity building which means they come in and work with a district in order to build the district's capacity to do the work on their own and then they remove themselves. It is not intended to be a long-term relationship. She would say that they would benefit from their expertise in terms of working with the community to make a determination as to what

the parents in Fall River need and could benefit from and then determine how they create a delivery system and content in order to match those needs.

Mr. Martins said the premise is good but asked if once it is in operation if there will be a need for an administrative staff to run the Parent Academy.

Superintendent Mayo-Brown responded that she would hope not because the appeal of having School and Main do this with them is to tap into what they already have in place. She noted that Barbara Allard was in the audience who is the Wrap-around Zone Coordinator, Parent Information Center Department Head, and Early Childhood Department Head. Ms. Allard does much of this work in her multiple roles and they do have a parent information center with a number of employees. They are taking a look at how that is organized. She would not come back to him to ask for a number of positions because the intent of the work is to do it school-based once it is designed.

Mr. Martins said his last concern was that he finds that he is leery of the cost growth over time. He would like to know what the total is. He noted that he was critical of having an associate principal and that seems to have grown. It was supposed to be in one school and then it went to other schools.

Superintendent Mayo-Brown interrupted that they only have one associate principal who is at Durfee. The Committee has only approved it for one school.

Mr. Martins asked if it was going to grow and if it was he wanted to know about it.

Mr. Andrade asked if the expenditure was most likely a one-time expenditure to have them help set up the program.

Superintendent Mayo-Brown said that she anticipates that they are going to see another contract come through because of where they are in the fiscal year and she does not know if they will use the \$40,000 given where they are now. They had proposed it in January and the work is starting after the Committee approves it in March so they are already in a shortened window and may be decreasing the contract amount and coming back to the Committee in the next fiscal year and seeking some funding to continue. She does not think that the stakeholders will be able to plan everything between March and June and thinks they will be back.

All were in favor	None were opposed	Motion passed
MOTION: Mrs. Panchley – Mr. Hart: To approve the contract for School and Main Institute.		
<u>No Discussion</u>		
All were in favor	None were opposed	Motion passed

FOR YOUR INFORMATION

MOTION: Mr. Hart – Mrs. Panchley: To place the FYI portion of the agenda on file.

Discussion

Mr. Martins questioned an appointment that was listed at \$8.25 per hour and asked if that was the actual amount or if it reflected the new minimum wage law.

Superintendent Mayo-Brown responded that when the individual was appointed that was the wage; however, that individual's wage was changed to the new minimum wage at \$9.00 per hour, effective January 1.

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

NEW BUSINESS

Mayor Sutter asked if there was any new business.

Mr. Hart said he had a couple of items. The first deals with the opiate addiction. A lot of commitment is being made by the Governor and also by Mayor Sutter in his inaugural speech. He thought given that there has been a lot of discussion about it that maybe they should look at the schools. He knows that there are programs in the schools currently that are dealing with those particular issues but thought that if there was anything that Mayor Sutter could get in terms of additional funding or something along those lines where they can, with the proper planning, they could push further in the school district as well. He did not bring the statistics with him but in his work he often sees the effects that addiction has on families. He thinks everything starts at home with the parents and teaching their children what is right and wrong but he also thinks that there may be an opportunity for the schools to increase awareness. He wanted to put it out there; nothing to approve tonight but just to get the Mayor's reflection on it as well.

Mayor Sutter thanked Mr. Hart for bringing it up. He thinks it's widely acknowledged that they have had a dramatic increase in opiate addiction throughout the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, New England, and probably throughout the United States. To the extent to which there is a prevention program in the schools right now is a matter that he and the Superintendent have only touched on briefly. As he has discussed with Mr. Hart, the District Attorney's Association received a sizable grant to study prevention programs, best practices throughout the Commonwealth and beyond which is taking place right now. He would be happy to report on that at the next meeting because he thinks it is a critical issue for the City of Fall River moving forward and that the solution to improving the problem is in the middle and perhaps elementary schools. He commended Mr. Hart again for bringing it up and he is in complete agreement with him that it is a critical issue for the city and he is looking forward to delving into it.

Mr. Hart thanked the Mayor and said the other item he has is for the Superintendent.

Mr. Hart said he had spoken to some people at RPS and asked if the guidance counselor position that was left by a transfer would be filled.

Superintendent Mayo-Brown responded that it would not and explained that the School Committee approved an administrator apprenticeship position for the Durfee Academy and that individual went over into that position. She further explained that RPS has approximately 181 students in their day

program and their attendance rate is about 50% and they have eight administrators. If they are struggling to meet the needs of students with that many administrators on staff she would be happy to sit down with them to see what is necessary in terms of utilizing those administrators to meet the needs of students. At this time, she would not recommend to the Committee a ninth administrator for that size of a program.

Mr. Hart asked who was doing the work for the guidance counselor.

Superintendent Mayo-Brown responded that there is one guidance counselor on staff currently and there are two program coordinators that could potentially do some guidance work. She heard a bit about it earlier in the day and has not been approached about it. She would be happy to sit down with any individuals at the school who are concerned about it so that they can collectively problem solve together.

Mr. Hart thought that would be a good idea to do because he is hearing it constantly. He had spoken with the Superintendent about RPS in the past in regards to substitutes and her feeling is that they are not needed there.

Superintendent Mayo-Brown interrupted by saying no; they have talked about administrators not substitutes. She heard that earlier in the day as well that they were not permitted to have substitutes which she will take a look at it because that is not coming from her.

Mr. Hart said he was not saying it was coming from her but that he had a talk with her about it.

Superintendent Mayo-Brown said that she does not recall the conversation which is why she is saying the substitute piece is new for her. She encouraged Mr. Hart that if there were concerns from staff at RPS and they feel like it is not being addressed by their Principal, that they get referred to the Superintendent so that she can hear directly from staff rather than under new business.

Mr. Hart asked if anyone has ever heard of issues at RPS with herself or Mr. Saunders.

Superintendent Mayo Brown said no.

Mr. Hart said he yielded but asked if possible that when this happens at any school; when a position is vacated to go to another place in the district...when they lose somebody like a guidance counselor...he thought there needed to be some type of policy. He asked if there was a policy in the school district that they fill that particular position.

Superintendent Mayo-Brown said no but she would double check. She thought she had written in their briefing that that move to support the Durfee Academy was cost neutral meaning that position would not be backfilled at RPS.

Mrs. Panchley responded that she did because she would have voted no if it was going to cost more.

Mr. Hart said that was fine and he approved that vote but did not realize when she said cost neutral. He did want that position at RPS to be filled.

Superintendent Mayo-Brown said they would have had to add an FTE to create the administrator apprentice program at Durfee Academy and then back fill but either way they were adding an FTE to the budget to do that.

Mr. Costa said that he had spoken with the Superintendent briefly and did not realize this was going to be discussed. He asked the Superintendent when they set the budget for this fiscal year, he thought they had a number of apprentice positions that were budgeted for.

Superintendent Mayo-Brown said that was correct.

Mr. Costa said if he heard her correctly when she said they would have to add an FTE; they would not because if they already had the apprentice positions budgeted and this person was simply leaving a guidance position into an apprentice position that is already budgeted, then they would just need to fill the vacancy that was left.

Superintendent Mayo-Brown said they had already filled the apprentice positions that the School Committee had budgeted. There was one at Kuss and one at Doran. This was a third administrator apprentice position.

Mr. Costa said he would have to go back to his notes. His understanding of the apprentice positions that were budgeted was that there were more than two. He does not recall a request for an additional apprentice position. His assumption was that these were budgeted positions that she was looking to fill and people who were leaving their positions they held currently to go into the apprentice position would leave their positions vacant. They can look at it. He thought there was an issue there that they needed to take a closer look at and come up with a resolution for. He added that there also may be other administrators who are in the building and available to do guidance type work but he cautioned that that may cause problems with the FRAA.

Superintendent Mayo-Brown agreed with Mr. Costa and said they have used that at Durfee High School with the Deans. There are provisions in the FRAA contract. She is happy to take a look at it. She heard much about it that day and had not had a chance to loop back to the school and would do that.

Mr. Maynard said he had received a few calls on that as well and asked if she could get down to the school to solve the problem.

Superintendent Mayo-Brown said that she would. She appreciated the Committee letting her know that the staff was concerned.

Mayor Sutter asked if there was any other new business and there was none.

REQUEST FOR EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mayor Sutter asked if there was a need for an Executive Session.

Attorney Assad responded there was pursuant to 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 as the Chair has determined that an open session

may have a detrimental impact on the position of the Fall River School Committee and also to discuss strategy with respect to non-union personnel, including Rene Kochman, Director of Operation and Director of Media for FRED TV; Joseph Correia, Director of Administrative Services; Scott Cabral, Network Technician; and Tom Coogan, Chief Operating Officer. We would reconvene and there may or may not be statements at that time.

MOTION: Mr. Hart – Mr. Maynard: To convene in executive session.

A roll call showed:

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

All were in favor

None Opposed

Motion passed (10:11 PM)

At 11:11 PM Mayor Sutter brought back to order the meeting of the Fall River School Committee for Monday, March 2, 2015.

A roll call for attendance showed:

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

Mayor Sutter asked if based upon discussions in Executive Session there were any motions to be made.

Mr. Costa said there were.

MOTION: Mr. Costa – Mr. Hart: To deny grievance 12-12.

No Discussion

All were in favor

None were opposed

Motion approved

MOTION: Mr. Costa – Mr. Hart: To approve the contract between the Fall River School Committee and the Fall River Administrators Association.

No Discussion

All were in favor

None were opposed

Motion approved

MOTION: Mr. Costa – Mr. Maynard: To approve the contract as negotiated between the Fall River School Committee and the maintenance union.

No Discussion

All were in favor

None were opposed

Motion approved

MOTION: Mr. Costa – Mr. Maynard: To approve the contract as negotiated between the Fall River School Committee and nutrition union.

No Discussion

All were in favor

None were opposed

Motion approved

MOTION: Mr. Costa – Mrs. Panchley: To approve the contract between the Fall River School Committee as negotiated with the custodians’ union.

No Discussion

A roll call showed:

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

6 were in favor 0 were opposed 1 abstained (Mr. Maynard) Motion approved

MOTION: Mr. Costa – Mrs. Panchley: To approve the contract between the Fall River School Committee and Mr. Rene Kochman.

No Discussion

All were in favor None were opposed Motion approved

MOTION: Mr. Costa – Mr. Hart: To approve the contract as negotiated between the Fall River School Committee and Mr. Tom Coogan.

No Discussion

All were in favor None were opposed Motion approved

MOTION: Mr. Costa – Mr. Andrade: That the Fall River School Committee support the accretion of the nurses into the union Unit A of the FREA.

No Discussion

All were in favor None were opposed Motion approved

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

No Discussion

All were in favor None were opposed Meeting Adjourned (11:14 PM)

Respectfully submitted,



Administrative Assistant for
School Committee Services