

Attleboro Public Schools  
Attleboro, Massachusetts  
School Committee Meeting  
Monday, September 26, 2011 @ 7:04 p.m.  
School Committee Conference Room – Attleboro High School

Present: Raymond DiCiaccio (At Large), Chairman; Melissa Cook (Ward I), Vice-Chairperson; James Stors (Ward II), Secretary; Bob Hill (Ward III), Brenda Furtado (Ward IV); Frances Zito (Ward V); Michael Levinson (Ward VI), and Helen Johnson (At Large)

Absent: Teri Enegren (At Large),

Also Present: Pia Durkin, Ph.D., Superintendent, Nancy Sprague, Director for Teaching & Learning Excellence, Marc Furtado, Business Manager, and Judy Nelson, Recording Secretary.

Meeting called to order at 7:00 p.m.

Salute to the Flag: Mr. DiCiaccio led the Committee in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Notice of Electronic Recording: Chairman DiCiaccio noted the meeting was being electronically recorded.

School Sponsored Events: Student Representative, Taylor Beland, updated the community on the school sponsored events (a copy of which is attached hereto and therefore made a part hereof).

Mr. DiCiaccio commented on the new basketball coach, Missy Traverse. He noted the Attleboro Youth Basketball will be holding free clinics for girls Grades 4, 5, and 6 at Attleboro High School this Friday, September 30<sup>th</sup> from 4:30 to 6:00 and for Grades 7, 8, and 9 from 7:00 to 9:00 p.m. which will be conducted by our new coach.

Attleboro's 1ABC project which occurs every year, this community-based project will focus on Mark Twain. Wednesday they will host Twain in Technology. Mr. DiCiaccio described this opportunity. This will be from 3:30 to 4:30 at Attleboro Public Library in conjunction with AACCS. Mr. DiCiaccio explained the details of this community-based offering. Those interested should contact either AACCS or the Attleboro Public Library.

Consent Agenda:

Vote to accept the donation in the amount of \$913.60 from Target Take Charge of Education to Attleboro High School for deposit in the Attleboro High School gifts/donation account: Motion was made to accept and seconded. Discussion: None: Vote: 8-0. Motion passes.

Vote to expend funds not to exceed \$58,600 from the Irwin Studley A. Trust Fund and to recommend to the Trust Commission of the City of Attleboro to release these funds.

Mr. DiCiaccio noted present this evening were to individuals who have worked very hard and involved with the project. He introduced Lance Hale and Matt Cody. He asked the two gentlemen to step forward. Jennella Porter, Principal of the Studley Elementary School was also present. Mr. DiCiaccio acknowledged their hard work. Mr. DiCiaccio stated this was discussed at a previous Finance Subcommittee Meeting as well.

It was noted to-date these individuals have raised approximately \$30,000. This was done through community outreach, grant applications, fundraising, and the realigning of PTO internal funding. The estimated cost of this project will be in the range of \$81,000. Mr. Hale explained the process and the undertaking. Companies were asked to provide a design in the \$50,000 range. There were 14 submissions, eight reviewed, and three were chosen for further evaluation. It was narrowed down to two who were interviewed and one manufacturer was chosen to bring this project forward. Parent, student, administrator, teacher (the physical education teacher in particular) input was sought. The physical education teacher was asked for input on the particular physical education elements that would be incorporated. The design was chosen that would fit the area and meet the needs of the school. The estimated cost for design and installation is \$80,444. A 10% contingency is being sought to cover anticipated costs that may arise during construction. The total funding raising goal was \$88,498.

Mr. DiCiaccio referenced the packet that was provided (a copy of which is attached hereto and therefore made a part hereof). Mr. DiCiaccio asked if the referenced items will fit in the current playground area. It was noted there would be an adjacent asphalt

area that will include the referenced items. It was noted some of these items are not only physical activities but also include mathematical aspects as well.

Mr. DiCiaccio asked for an explanation of the aspects of the trust fund. Mr. DiCiaccio noted \$30,000 have been raised to-date. There is an Irwin A. Studley Trust Fund. A request is being made for the remaining costs of the project come from this trust fund.

Mr. Hale noted they have raised 1/3 of the funds. The request for the remaining 2/3 to complete the project is being sought. The trust fund is administered through the City. The Superintendent and the School Committee are co-signers of the trust. The trust funds were put in place strictly for the use of the children of the Studley Elementary School. The principal and the committee feel this would be good use of these funds. The children would benefit from this project.

Mr. DiCiaccio asked the Business Manager, Marc Furtado to explain his understanding of the Trust.

Mr. Furtado spoke over the phone with the City Treasurer who confirmed this would be an appropriate use of these funds. He noted following the finance committee meeting last week, he requested from the Treasurer any documentation that would speak to the mission or purpose of these funds. No information was provided. Mr. Furtado went to City Hall today and was informed the Treasurer would not be back into the office until Wednesday.

Mr. Hale noted they met with the City Treasurer on three occasions and had many phone conversations. The Treasurer introduced them to the process and how to best undertake this process. When the project initiated and they discovered the funds existed, they did not want to come to the committee and ask for the full amount. They wanted to show due diligence and hard work.

Ms. Porter noted this process began last September/October.

Mr. DiCiaccio stated this was placed on the Agenda for approval. Unfortunately, we were unable to get some of the requested information. Mr. DiCiaccio acknowledged the time constraints of the project. He believed a vote this evening would be appreciated. He did acknowledge there were some members who wanted more information. Mr. DiCiaccio noted perhaps the committee might vote tonight, understanding that a meeting is scheduled for next Monday night, the Treasurer will be back on Wednesday, the information will be obtained, and if members are not comfortable this could be discussed at next week's meeting.

Mr. Furtado noted this item would not be brought before the trust fund commission before next Monday night's meeting.

Mr. Stors noted if that were the case would holding this item until next Monday really be an issue.

Mr. Furtado noted the timeline on the side of the Studley Playground Committee. Mr. Furtado stated he was not sure when the next trust commission meeting was, but noted it was not in the next few days.

Dr. Durkin noted a letter has to be done by her as Superintendent stating the vote such as. She would wait until the material was received.

Mr. Hill noted their due diligence. He stated the school committee is not the trustees of the funds. Mr. Hill stated the trust commission is not going to release the funds that do not fit the purpose of that trust. Mr. Hill stated he did not see what the big issue was. If the trust commission is willing to release the funds and it is appropriate, let's do it.

Mr. Levinson agreed. He noted this was discussed in the Finance Sub-Committee meeting. He applauded the work done by these people. Mr. Levinson noted we are not the trustees. We start the process, the superintendent writes the letter, and the trust commission has the discretion to interpret the documents. Mr. Levinson so no problem with approving this request tonight. He noted if this does not fit the mold of the trust, the trustees will not distribute the funds. Mr. Levinson saw no harm in moving forward.

Mr. DiCiaccio stated this group has worked hard to explore and understand the purpose of the trust and releasing of the trust funds. We have been assured through administration, Marc Furtado and Dr. Durkin, through Matt, Lance, and Mrs. Porter that everything indicates that this is consistent with the purpose of the trust.

Mrs. Zito stated she believed the Committee should vote this evening.

Mr. Stors note having been part of a playground process before, he noted there are a lot of requirements for the turf. He asked what the plans were for the turf below the equipment.

Mr. Hale noted it has been determined there is currently sufficient "fall protection" underneath. The plan is to move this off to the side, pull it back in, and augment as required after the project is done.

Mr. Stors asked if this involved tire shed.

Mr. Hale noted what is currently there is wood fiber.

Motion was made to approve to expend funds not to exceed \$58,600 from the Irwin A. Studley Trust Fund and to recommend to the Trust Fund of the City of Attleboro to release these funds. The motion as seconded: Discussion: None. Vote: 8-0. Motion passes.

The committee thanked everyone for all their hard work.

#### Unfinished Business:

MSBA – Marc Furtado, Business Manager (Administration Report): Mr. Furtado noted there was not a lot to add from the previous update. The repairs have been acted upon. He believed they were all completed from the very fortuitous rain storm we experienced. A construction meeting will be held Wednesday at 2:00 p.m. to review final documents and reports. There is a School Building Commission Meeting on November 10<sup>th</sup> the process the final change orders. There will then be one more School Committee Building Meeting held to close out the project but, essentially the project is complete at this point.

Coelho Roof – Marc Furtado, Business Manager (Administration Report): There was nothing new to report to the committee on the Coelho Roof. The heavy rains a few weeks ago did not penetrate the roof. We are still putting together a comprehensive cost estimate for the full repair of the roof.

X2 Implementation – Marc Furtado, Business Manager (Administration Report): Mr. Furtado noted X2 was on site for two days over the past two weeks. There is still one more day scheduled for them to come to the district. They dealt with the local concerns at the school levels. The Advisory Committee has been formed and is receiving information centrally. This will allow a question to be answered once rather than multiple times. Some good progress has been made. There is still work to do. We are contemplating bringing in a single clerk who in the past has done database work for the district. This will assist with reviewing the data that come from Rediker that the clerks have voiced concerns about. In addition, the Registrar is with child and will be taking maternity leave. We are reviewing whether this should be a clerical role or updating that to include a technician role that would provide registrar/technical support for example formatting reports etc. There is a lot of work to do, but a lot of work is being done.

Mr. DiCiaccio noted the Registrar is someone who is working with the system on a daily basis who has the technical ability as well.

Mrs. Furtado noted that we are saying that the information that was supposed to be taken from Rediker and placed into the X2 system has some glitches. She asked if the data did not transfer exactly as we planned.

Mr. Furtado explained the data is there, but for example in a field where one is supposed to enter an address the setup is not always formatted to provide enough entry areas. The clerks were not trained on how to adjust field sizes. We are reviewing how to fix these areas without requiring our Network Director to go to each school and individually fix the fields.

Mrs. Furtado stated that what we needed from X2, they basically could not give us that. We are required to go back and configure these items. Mrs. Furtado noted she was trying to understand the process.

Mr. Furtado explained that when inputting a document into a spreadsheet one month you might need more input fields. We need to figure out how to increase the fields to accommodate the different needs. It is not that the program cannot do it.

Mr. DiCiaccio interjected giving the example that if someone used Quick Books and switched to Peach Tree, sometimes the field accommodations are different. He noted data conversions are tricky because sometimes different terminology is used.

Mr. Furtado noted there are small quirks. As the clerks work and familiarize themselves with the different process the adjustments will become easier to understand and deal with.

Mrs. Furtado asked if these adjustments can be made at one level and then distributed throughout the computers or is it each school.

Mr. Furtado explained the data feeds up centrally. This is something we did not have before.

Mrs. Furtado asked if a computer adjustment was needed, could X2 perform this, and then shoot out centrally.

Mr. Furtado stated he did not believe so.

Mrs. Furtado noted that it was at each school through the individual clerks.

Mr. DiCiaccio stated he believed X2 was one "relational" database. He stated this was one of the advantages to this system versus Rediker.

Mr. Furtado noted he believed data-wise, he was not sure formatting-wise.

Mrs. Furtado stated for example if the computer needed a formatting change to input the addresses was this something that could be done and then formatted throughout or would it have to be done school-based.

Mr. Furtado noted if the formatting were relational, then the OIT Administrator would have had the ability to do it. He explained that is why we are visiting individual schools. Each school has their own formatting requirements.

High School Parking Lot – Marc Furtado, Business Manager (Administration Report): Mr. Furtado noted he had a second meeting with John Clover who has agreed to come by with his foreman to meet with the Facilities Manager, Jason Parenteau to walk the parking lot, comprise an estimate, meet with the Mayor to discuss the project. He noted a formal answer would be forthcoming.

Mr. DiCiaccio asked what the anticipated timeframe was.

Mr. Furtado explained it was his understanding that within a couple of weeks we will have an answer certainly within the season. Mr. Clover recommended the Police Chief be involved regarding the traffic flow.

Pipe Repair Contract for Attleboro High School – Marc Furtado, Business Manager (Administration Report): Mr. Furtado explained that this had originally been anticipated to be a summer repair job. The school is in session and therefore, most of the work will be done on a second shift. This is not the type of job we want lay people exposed to both from a "noise" perspective and "crud" perspective. There will be a premium on the contract to perform this during a second shift. There is no way around this. We debated waiting to perform this during the extended vacation in December. This project involves shutting the heat down and this might cause further issues for example bursting of pipes. The November vacation was not long enough as the anticipated time frame is ten to 12 days.

Ms. Cook asked how much the premium would be.

Mr. Furtado noted approximately \$8,000. This falls under 30b which requires prevailing wage costs and allows for up to a 25% adder as long as it based on the same unit cost which would be the prevailing wage and nothing else such as a management fee.

Mr. Stors asked if there were any way to split it so that it was not total second shift costs.

Mr. Furtado confirmed that the whole job would not be done on the second shift. Just the portion of the project that we do not want people exposed to.

Mr. DiCiaccio stated they are able to do the work at night and this will not impact the kids the next day.

Mr. Furtado noted that whole section of the building will be corded off.

Mr. DiCiaccio asked if the committee needed to approve the work.

Mr. Furtado stated no, he just wanted the committee to be aware of the work.

Dr. Durkin noted this was for informational purposes.

Mr. DiCiaccio asked when we perceive the work to begin.

Mr. Furtado stated we are still waiting for them to provide us with documents. He noted because of amount of the project they are required to provide us with a payment bond. They have not done that and we are waiting for this to commence the project.

Transportation: Mr. Furtado noted we are beginning the third week. We have accommodated all fee for service. The walker applications are still being processed, but the remaining fee for service have all been assigned seats. As of last Friday, we have approximately 106 walkers who still are waiting for an assignment. Many of those appear to be on buses that are currently at capacity. Mr. Furtado was not sure how many of the walkers we will be able to accommodate going forward. In terms of departures and arrivals, today was a good day. We had two buses at Thacher that were late coming in this morning, but other than that, we are not aware of other buses being late today which is pretty good.

Mr. DiCiaccio stated he had been in communication with some parents who have said over the past two weeks it has gotten much better.

Mr. Furtado noted we have started to reassign streets to level the capacity of the buses. We are picking up students, sifting out the students who do not belong, level the distribution across buses, and today the results were fairly good except for the two this morning at Thacher.

Ms. Cook asked if the possibility of not being able to fit all the walkers on the bus was typical. She asked if this had happened in the last year.

Mr. Furtado noted not last year, but his second year here, there were approximately 20 students at Brennan that were not able to be accommodated. This may be a similar situation this year.

Ms. Cook stated around 20 students not 100.

Mr. Furtado noted approximately 20.

Mr. DiCiaccio noted a question he is asked a lot is about the distance a person has to be from the school to qualify for bussing and how these lines were determined.

Mr. Furtado explained we have a database by street address. Those specific addresses are assigned a status. The status could be free transportation which means per school committee policy you are entitled to be transported to school for free. Another designation might be free for service. A third designation is walker. A fourth designation is that it is free for a "safety reason" for example areas of the community where there are no sidewalks, construction, or the area of the Olive Street Bridge which had been out which abandoned a group on the other side of that bridge. There are areas which are a safety concern another example being the Newport Avenue area and because of these safety designations these students are picked up for free. Those designations are done by the Police Department primarily through the DARE Officer. This is not something that might be seen as a conflict of interest if the school department was making these types of decisions. If a parent calls with a concern about a bus stop, this is then relayed to the DARE Officer who investigates the area, and makes a determination, and we abide by that decision. In a case for fee for service, we have had the DARE Officer measure a distance from a specific home address. A decision is made and we abide by that determination. Mr. Furtado stated when there is new construction in the City, it might fall along the imaginary line, and sometimes one half of a new street is free and the other is determined to be fee for service, our designation is based on a historical designation. If a parent were to have questioned an area, we would send the DARE Officer there to review and make a decision.

Open Forum: Mr. DiCiaccio explained the guidelines for Open Forum.

Jennifer Crowder noted she was part of the Ward IV district and is a parent of a special needs student. Ms. Crowder provided handouts to the school committee regarding the situation she has been having with the school district including a complaint that was filed with the Board of Education PQA Unit along with their finalized report.

Mr. DiCiaccio stated Ms. Crowder could pass out the information, but he voiced concern about this type of situation. Mr. DiCiaccio explained this type of issue usually is discussed with the Director of Special Education and the School Administration. Mr. DiCiaccio stated he did not want to cut her off, but this was something the School Committee is not involved without working through the proper channels.

Ms. Crowder acknowledged Mr. DiCiaccio's concerns. She stated that she has gone through these channels on numerous occasions. She stated there has not been compliance. Ms. Crowder stated the committee should know about the final report.

She claimed the school has been in noncompliance with over ten issues and insinuated the state funding for the school district is in jeopardy now as of October 21<sup>st</sup> per the Final Report. She stated this is an issue she felt should come to light.

Dr. Durkin stated that she and Mrs. Crowder have met. She acknowledged that Mrs. Crowder had a number of issues that Ms. Martiesian is currently addressing. Mrs. Crow has attained an attorney. The school system attorney is involved as well. These attorneys are working together to resolve the situation. Dr. Durkin agreed with the Chairman that this is best resolved at the school level. We will work with her. She did file a complaint and that is her right to do that. We have a copy of the Complaint and are working through those issues. Dr. Durkin noted the issue about funding is probably misinterpreted. She informed the committee that the issues are being dealt with extensively at the school level with Ms. Martiesian. Dr. Durkin stated she would provide the committee with a background report on what information she could provide in the Friday Update. Dr. Durkin asked Mrs. Crowder if her attorney had been in touch with the district.

She confirmed that they had.

Dr. Durkin stated it is good to have an attorney involved who advocates for the family. The Superintendent noted we encourage that so that issues can be resolved in the most fairest of ways. The parent is then represented as is the district through their legal counsel.

Mrs. Crowder noted she believed the school committee should know that funding is now in jeopardy and a lot of these issues have not been addressed. She stated this has been a process for over a year now. Ms. Crowder felt she had been getting the run around from two different schools to-date as well as the Superintendent's Office. Ms. Crowder felt this needed to come to another forum.

Ms. Martiesian stated the district received the QA findings last week and she had contacted the Quality Assurance because there were three issues where the school was not in compliance. Ms. Martiesian explained the process how when a district is found non-compliant a corrective action plan is provided. There was an area of the reports where there questions and we asked for clarity. We contacted the officer at PQA where we provided additional information. We are awaiting a call back as there is a finding that we need clarified. Ms. Martiesian noted this is an ongoing process. She stated at this time, the district is not in jeopardy of losing funding. The district is required to establish a compensatory plan, sit down the parent and their representatives, and agree on how these services can be provided. Ms. Martiesian stated the district is working on this. If a district were to ignore a situation, then a problem would arise with funding. We are very much involved and this is not the case. Ms. Martiesian noted we are working with PQA and plan to resolve this.

Ms. Crowder stated she disagreed. She noted she had been trying to resolve this issue for over a year. She referred to page seven of the Final PQA Report which states that if the district and the parents are unable to develop a mutually agreeable plan of compensatory services by October 21, 2011, the Board of Education will develop a plan to specify compensatory services that the district must provide. Failure to implement such a plan may result in withholding funds. This has been highlighted in the copies as well.

Dr. Durkin noted a parent, and Mrs. Crowder is doing the right thing about pursuing the services for her child. She noted the information before you, each school committee member, is confidential. She noted as the agent for the school district she felt compelled to stress this information cannot be shared. This contains specific information about her child and her child's disability. She has chosen to speak about this and is a good parent trying to get what she wants for her child and we are working with her. Dr. Durkin stated there are many complexities to this and that is the part of the special education law that we are trying to work through with her advocate and her attorney. She stated in her experience here with two Special Education Directors, we have never ignored any finding by the Department of Education. Please be assured that this will be resolved. We are working through those services. We have never been threatened with loss of funding when it comes to general funding. If there are compensatory services, which there may be, we will provide them. These are referred to "make up" services. We are more than willing to do this and have done this in instances and this has never been a point of disagreement for us. We are in the process of clarifying as Ms. Martiesian noted. The Superintendent noted the committee had the information and she would be happy to answer questions and provide this through the update. Dr. Durkin did not feel comfortable in a public setting discussing this.

Mrs. Crowder noted in the outline that was provided, on the second page there is my written expressed permission in order for his public records to be released. She noted her awareness that this goes on public record and stated no issues submitting any other document even if they become public record. If there is any other information, that would be open for review as well.

Mr. DiCiaccio stated he did not see any contact information. He stated the disadvantage to receiving this information this evening. He again reiterated that during open forum the committee does not respond. Mr. DiCiaccio in these circumstances we rely on staff. He stated the committee did care about her concerns as he believed the administration did as well. Mr. DiCiaccio stated they would work through the administration to "get their arms" around this and work through it.

Mrs. Crowder stated up to this point, she felt every stone wall had been put up in front of her. This is why she felt it needed to be brought to another attention. She stated when she moved here in May last year, she contacted Social Services to open a voluntary case plan in order to get the slightest bit of cooperation from the school, from the Superintendent, and there is an e-mail from earlier in the year wherein the Superintendent stated she would follow up and be "on top" of this, and here we are a year later and it is unresolved. It is gradually increasing into a larger issue now where there are more complaints in process.

Mr. DiCiaccio noted in fairness to Dr. Durkin and her staff. Mr. DiCiaccio stated he knew how serious they take every child. We will review the packet.

Dr. Durkin stated the administration would continue to work with Mrs. Crowder.

Mr. DiCiaccio stated he was confident a good effort would be put into resolving this. He noted he understood where this was Mrs. Crowder's child and that nothing is more important than one's child. Mr. DiCiaccio stated the whole committee was very sensitive to this.

Mrs. Crowder stated it was not just her child. Her child's IEP should be the simplest to process. There are also the other children who have more extreme needs whose parents cannot make this a full-time job to ensure their education and IEP's are being properly followed. Mrs. Crowder noted she would provide contact information and be happy to submit any further records that might be necessary. Mrs. Crowder stated anyone could contact her. She then went on to state that there is a Medicaid fraud case that is also being investigated for billing for services that have not been provided for the IEP's. This is still an open and ongoing investigation.

Mr. DiCiaccio again stated without knowing all the facts.

Mrs. Crowder stated she just wanted to bring this to the committee's attention.

Mr. DiCiaccio thanked Mrs. Crowder for coming forward. Mr. DiCiaccio stated he believed there would be a good effort going forward to get everything rectified.

#### New Business

#### MCAS Achievement/Adequate Yearly Progress Update:

Dr. Durkin noted the information being provided tonight was completed late this afternoon. There has been quite a bit of information that has grown over the past from the DESE. Dr. Durkin noted a test run was done last week at the Curriculum and Instruction Sub-Committee meeting last week with Mr. Levinson and Mrs. Zito. This information was still being modified at three o'clock this afternoon. She thanked the committee for their patience. The data can be complex. We are trying very hard to give the public and committee the most information in the most simplistic of terms. She stated that respectfully. One of the issues is that the No Child Left Behind has grown "arms and legs" in the short time it has been in effect. Dr. Durkin encouraged the committee to ask questions. She noted Ms. Sprague and Michelle Roy, the Data and Accountability Coordinator were here this evening to assist with the presentation.

Mr. DiCiaccio noted on a good note and bad note, the committee has another meeting next Monday. He noted because there is a lot of data involved and a lot of data for everyone to put together, we can also continue and bring forward questions next week as well.

Dr. Durkin stated we always begin with the Vision. She noted the importance as this is what keeps our focus. When we talk about excellence, it is something we are always attempting to achieve. The committee will hear a lot about subgroups. There is also a new term being used by the DESE called "high need" meaning a child can be in 1, 2, or 3 subgroups and the challenge of that and what that looks like in terms of data. These numbers represent each of our 6000 students. The diversity of subgroups for the administration and staff that is here tonight is what makes Attleboro the great place to be and what we can add through that. Powerful learning for example it is not enough to read in Attleboro, we want our kids to comprehend at deeper levels. It is not enough to write, we want our kids to persuasively provide evidence and become proficient writers in their careers. It is not enough to compute. We want them to solve multi-step problems and do so in reasoning formats. This cannot be done alone. Collaboration must happen constructively. Those two words are extremely important and take on meanings in many ways that we are trying to do. The goal for tonight is to provide an overview review and share the progress made, to look at the results in district and school improvement strategies. This meeting and the one next week will be followed up by individual PTO meetings at the school level that will go into greater depth at the schools. We will look at our next steps for continued progress which will then help formulate the District/Superintendent 2011-12 District Goals which drive the focus of the Whole School Improvement

Plans (WSIPs). An important piece is talking about actual performance and current federal requirements. This is very timely. The committee has heard the Superintendent speak about there is a difference in failing schools and those that are failing to meet federal requirements.

A few things have happened since the last meeting. Last week, the Superintendent was privileged to be asked to attend a meeting with Commissioner with nine (9) other Superintendents in Malden to meet two gentlemen from the federal government who have worked with Secretary Duncan. Attleboro was one of the only districts that was not a Level 4 district. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss how the No Child Left Behind is going to unfold over the next few years. It was very clear that we are the state that has the highest achievement rates in the country. We are the state that is correlated with the National Assessment of Educational Progress and yet we have 91% of our districts and over 80% of our schools that are labeled in somewhat of failing categories. There is something wrong with that picture. The Commissioner along with the two gentlemen who came from Washington were very eager. On Friday there was an article in the Globe and also now there has been endorsed by the Massachusetts Association of School Superintendents and the Massachusetts Association for School Committees where the President is looking at ways to look at waivers for No Child Left Behind. The devil will be in the details. The importance is recognizing that we are not by any means giving up on advancement and proficiency for every single child in Attleboro and beyond. What we are looking at, is if we look at the No Child Left Behind requirements, how can every child, make the same progress during the same period of time at the same period of rate. Anyone that is in education or close to education being our families and community understand that that is simply not a possibility. There are three things we need. We need resources and we have some of the best people in the commonwealth who are serving kids to help them advance in their core subject areas. We need time because most children do need time and we need the understanding that this is a very complex issue. Not every child is going to be able to reach 100% proficiency by 2014. This was stated when this law was put into effect. That does not beg off the issues of expectations and the importance of it.

On Sunday there was another article headlined about MCAS scores appear stuck with the stubborn income gap talking about how low income students are not fairing as well. We know that, in Attleboro; which was the importance of the state report that was issued to the Committee a few weeks ago; we have the ways of really attacking and deciphering why students with low income needs may not be making progress. We know what to do, but she addressed the need to have the time and resources to address this and do it in a logical way. Dr. Durkin wanted to share with the committee what the federal government is leaning toward. This will happen over the next several weeks. The Superintendent noted that today the Commissioner stated through an e-mail that he will file for a waiver. What the waiver states in no shape or form is that we are backing off the commitment. It does allow for some flexibility which will be defined over the coming months.

Mr. DiCiaccio stated when they state by 2014 it is 100%; you are talking about every subgroup.

Dr. Durkin confirmed this noting every child. She noted the gentlemen from Washington were listening and feels the Commissioner is also listening. We also have to take into consideration that the test that is used in Massachusetts is a very rigorous, high standard test. That is not the case across the country. Yes there might be states that have higher proficiency rates, but the means of measuring this is clearly not to the demands of Massachusetts. That is an important factor and why it correlates with the National Assessment of Educational Progress.

Dr. Durkin stated Ms. Roy will refresh the public on how the CPI (Composite Performance Index) points which is one part of this data. The CPI points determine if you have met Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP). What is being provided this evening is not only that information, but also for you to understand and appreciate the growth that students have made even in our schools that have not made adequate yearly progress. When we look at this data we can see broad brush. Ms. Sprague will also go through that, but also as you peel it back to really decipher what has gone on with our schools and what we are doing. We do have mixed results. We mirror very much what the state is. Superintendent noted we had good news, some disappointing news, and some in between.

Ms. Roy noted CPI is an acronym the committee has probably heard before. It represents the Composite Performance Index. It is how the state gives us information on all of our students and some of the subgroups. How this is calculated in simple terms is that if a student scores at proficient or advanced they are assigned 100 points. If they score in the high portion of needs improvement band, they receive 75 points. If they score in the lower portion of the needs improvement band, they receive 50 points. If they score in the higher part of the warning or failing category, they receive 25, and if they score in the lower portion of the warning or failing, they receive zero. They take all of the points, depending on which groups they are counting toward, and sometimes they can be in multiple groups, they take these points, add them up, and divide by the number of students in that group. On the reports that we have in order to get a CPI for a group, the group has to have at least 40 students.

Dr. Durkin wanted to clarify. You will see that some of our elementary schools may not have subgroups. We do have subgroups, but do not have 40 in number. They are counted into the district performance. No student is uncounted.

Mr. DiCiaccio stated it is subgroup and also by school.

Dr. Durkin noted if they are not to the number 40, as the committee will remember, last year at the high school we were 42 in Hispanic and the year before we did not have a subgroup. It happens and varies. The real answer is that you work hard to develop good instruction for all kids and cannot count on subgroups because one never knows.

The State Performance Chart: Dr. Durkin noted she would begin and Ms. Sprague would continue with this category. She noted that last year we were at the same target level of 90.2. We are no longer in the lower levels and it is much harder to achieve between 90 and 95 than it was between 45 and 50. The committee understands this. Last year we stayed the same at the performance target. The state looks at Adequate Yearly Progress two ways: performance and improvement. You receive credit for both, however, when you look at 90.2, we went up significantly: 8 points up in Math and 5 points up in ELA. Part of us believes that if we were to stay at 90.2, in our dreams, we would have made AYP in a number of ways.

Ms. Sprague reiterated what the Superintendent stated. These were the goals that were set in 2001 so that we could all reach 100% in proficiency, every single student being proficient in Math and English Language Arts, actually starting in 2013, but ultimately ending in 2014. The goals are set in two year segments. The goal for English Language Arts that was set in 2001 was 95.1. What the state actually achieved was around 88. Ms. Sprague noted the state has not been able to keep up the pace as we get to the top end of this chart, as well as, every other district is struggling as well or at least 92% of the districts. The Math expectation that was set in 2001 was 92.2, but what actually happened in Massachusetts is the state is at 82.3. It is important to recognize, as the Superintendent has noted, there are two ways to meet to AYP; one being through these targets that was set through a mathematical equation; and the other to show a certain amount of improvement each year. As the Superintendent mentioned, when you are down at 53, it is a little easier to get up to 60-68, but when up in the 80s and 90s, it becomes increasingly more difficult to be able to go up eight points which is the expectation from 2010 to 2011.

Mr. DiCiaccio noted we are also trying to do this with new sets of students coming in at different skill levels.

Ms. Sprague noted this is especially true when you are looking not only at the aggregate, but (new 3<sup>rd</sup> Graders and 10<sup>th</sup> Graders who have gone on to graduate), but also when looking at our subgroups. For example: Limited English Learners proficient subgroups. Students come in and they move into the country, they do not speak English; and over 3 to 5 to 7 years those students gain proficiency and they are moved out of that category. That subgroup is constantly changing subgroup, yet the expectation is that you go up for example from 2010 to 2011 by eight points, but we do not have the same students.

Dr. Durkin noted we do have some information that we will show later. We have tracked the same group of students from Grade 3 to Grade 10 to see how they did. That is cohort data. We tried to show different ways to see if we are making progress as we go through that.

Performance and Improvement Ratings: Dr. Durkin noted this is listed for every school. Dr. Durkin asked Ms. Roy to elaborate.

Ms. Roy noted the state gives us two additional ratings. What is important here is that you can still not make AYP, but can make high or very high. If you're Composite Performance Index (CPI), if you do the math and it comes out between 80 and 80.9, your rate is high for that particular subject. It does not mean that you made AYP. If you fall in the 90 to 100 band for your CPI, you are rated very high. You also get a rating on whether you met the target. There are two parts to the formula. Whether you did with the state target graph and also whether you were in your improvement band. They give us two ratings to let us know how we are scoring and whether we have met the improvement target.

Meeting Adequate Yearly Progress: Dr. Durkin noted for us, the district, she noted you can see that we are still in the high performance rating, and we have had not change. We did not go down and we did not go up. She noted some of the scores are flat. This is not too exciting. There are some spots where there is declining, but in looking at declining, there may have been great growth. It is part of the whole picture. We are up to almost 90 in ELA and up to almost 85 in Math as a district.

District Results (All Students CPI): The dark bold is where Attleboro has increased. If you have less than two points, it is not really statistically improving. She noted we went up .1 in ELA in the aggregate, but we want to improve far more than that, but we are creeping up there. In Math, in Special Education we had a little bit of a drop, in Limited English Learners close to 2 in improvement; that is significant. Low Income we did better in Math than in ELA. In five out of the 10 subgroups areas, in both ELA and Math, we made positive gains. Dr. Durkin stated she wanted to cautious as it is small, but we are moving in the right direction.

Ms. Roy noted if the group is 400 or larger a significant change would be about 2 points, less than 400 it would be about 2.5.

Levels of Adequately Yearly Progress: Dr. Durkin re-explained these categories to the committee.

MCAS Performance and AYP Factors: One of the key factors is that our targets today are 5 to 8 points higher than the FY10 targets. The FY13 Goal is 100%. Increasing from Very High/High Performance (80 to 100) points is very difficult. Very High/High Performance does not equal no status for AYP and the closer the CPI is to 100 points the greater the difficulty of meeting improvement targets.

ELA School News: In five of the elementary; in Studley we are in Improvement Year 1 for subgroups. ELL students in Grade 3 went up 7 CPI points. That is a good gain. Ms. Porter has put a tremendous effort into unpacking this data, but still did not make it to Adequate Yearly Progress. Typical growth is between 40 to 60 and 60 at the high end; their growth from 3<sup>rd</sup> to 4<sup>th</sup> Grade was 68.5; we are doing the right things. They were at the top end of high rate. Some standards the ELL students did better than the non-ELL students in terms of English Language. Clearly we are doing the right things. This is very disheartening. We need to keep our motivation up. We cannot fall back into despair.

At the middle school level, we have a Brennan Report that tells us that what we are doing is the right stuff. However, we missed the AYP status groups for subgroups. Across the middle schools you will see we have an issue from 4<sup>th</sup> to 5<sup>th</sup> Grade. We clearly need to develop strong transition structures and we have begun. The principals and teachers are working together between those two units to do it better. Similar to what we did when we found the writing in Grade 10 was not reflecting what needed to happen in middle school from Grade 8 to 10. We have seen some very good results. This is an issue across the district and will be addressed in the District/Superintendent Goals. It involves comprehension, vocabulary, but also involves what we are doing in 4<sup>th</sup> Grade that I as a teacher needs to know what needs to happen in 5<sup>th</sup> Grade and what the 5<sup>th</sup> Grade teachers need to know about what is going on in 4<sup>th</sup> Grade.

Ms. Sprague noted it was an interesting dilemma to try to figure out. How can we better transition our students from five elementary schools into three middle schools. Our curriculum and materials are consistent. There is something that is not consistent in the shift. We have started with principals visiting other schools and asking what does good instruction look like in English Language Arts and Mathematics. Looking at Grade 4 and Grade 5 to gather evidence to get results we need to improve instruction. We plan to also send teachers back and forth as well. We will start to look at some work across etc. Discussion of the structure of the classroom is being reviewed along with grouping of children. We do not have the answers at this time. We are developing and investigation plan that will provide some concrete ideas and suggestions for Grades 4 and 5. This is no one's fault. Both sides will be reviewed to sure up that transition for the district.

Dr. Durkin noted the need to answer the question, why did this occur. We are being candid. She is confident the staff will figure this out. We will come up with structures and supports that will help this transition process.

The high school is in Restructuring Year 1. We have a lot of students doing good things, we were accredited, and the commissioner visited here and felt we are doing the right things. The dropout rate is decreasing. Advanced Placement is increasing. We are closing the gap.

Mrs. Furtado noted Wamsutta Middle School we are in Improvement Year 1. Are we in improvement Year 2 in the subgroup.

Dr. Durkin noted we made Adequate Yearly Progress, but they keep you there for two years to ensure it sticks.

Mrs. Furtado noted so it stays as a Year 1, doesn't become Year 2.

Dr. Durkin stated we need to maintain so that next year we will be in No Status. We have done a lot of work with ELL students, but again noted the general concern for 5<sup>th</sup> Graders across the district.

Mr. Stors noted with regard to Wamsutta for both Math in the aggregate.

Dr. Durkin noted she had not gotten to Math.

Mr. Stors noted they made it with ELA, but not in the Math.

Dr. Durkin confirmed this. She noted it is difficult because you need to look at ELA for two years and the data for Math for two years as well. For the district we are in Improvement Year 2 for the subgroups. No status for all the elementary schools. In Brennan we moved from an 81.3 to an 81.9 CPI status. It was not enough to get us over the hump and therefore we are in Corrective Action for subgroups. Yet our low income subgroup students are making progress. Coelho we are in Restructuring Year 2. For Wamsutta there was a drop, but because we were No Status, this is the year of reprieve. In other words a year to get on top of it, we did decline in Math, but this is being reviewed.

In Attleboro High School the Math data was a disappointment, but the Superintendent pointed out she wanted to present a clear picture. We had in subgroups, particularly with our students with disabilities; six students did not take the test. She could not elaborate on the reasoning. The superintendent noted these six students made a big difference. Mr. Newman and Mr. Sawyer confirmed we were able to target it back to this. One was motivational; one not available, this was not an excuse, the superintendent was showing how every student counts. This was one of the reasons we are focusing on the motivational factors. If a student does not complete the test, you receive a zero. This becomes part of the average. Six might seem like a small amount, but it is not when factored into the average. There were 25 failures in Math and 12 in ELA generally.

Mr. Stors asked about the quantity of students in the special education subgroup. Mr. Stors was wondering how six would really factor in.

Ms. Roy noted the number was in the low to mid 60's.

Dr. Durkin noted that some of these students are also in the altered assessment. Those students have a different way of portraying their performance and improvement. We learned something new this year in terms of how they were rated. She asked Ms. Roy to elaborate.

Ms. Martiesian stated the scoring process was changed last year. If a student did everything right, they would receive 100 points. Other disabilities for example high incidence, if everything were done right, would only receive 75 points.

Dr. Durkin noted this was a game changer. If children are going to demonstrate how they are going to make progress and they are not getting the full credit, this does make an impact on the subgroup performance. She stated we want all our children to be tested. Dr. Durkin explained the alternate assessment is a tremendous amount of work for our teacher to demonstrate competency on that.

Ms. Roy noted, in the high school, there are 53 in this subgroup. The fact that those students, even if they score at the highest bank, can no longer get 100 points presents a flaw in the formula. If the committee remembers, we have to get to 100. Therefore, even if we have one or two students who are unable to reach that is very possible.

Mr. Stors stated he was looking at the high school data he put together when researched the other day. The high school looks like they did amazing with the exception of the one group. Every other subgroup were in the 80s and 90s. The aggregate in ELA 95.8 and the aggregate in Math 89.6, it is just that one subgroup.

Dr. Durkin noted then you get put in restructuring subgroup because it does not matter what subgroup, they are all treated equally. She reminded the committee many of those children might be in two or three subgroups. They are counted in each subgroup. That is another aspect.

Ms. Roy noted that goes without despair. You could have a high or very high CPI and still not make Adequate Yearly Progress.

Ms. Sprague noted all of our schools are either high or very high in performance. When you see corrective action it is shocking. They are still between 80 and 100 in their performance, it is just they did not make that leap high enough to be able to meet the standard that was set on the original chart.

Dr. Durkin noted Attleboro is a Level II District. She noted we were a Level III a few years ago, and now we are Level II. She noted a Level IV is the lowest 20% throughout the state. We thought we were Level III. When you have 91% of the districts in some type of failing category in 82% of the schools, she noted on the MASC website or the MASS website in which it talked about back in 2002 there was an analyst who looked at this data and predicted by 2014, exactly on target that if the law did not change that over 80% of districts would be in some type of status. This slightly reflects the country as well. She did not have the national data available. This is 1400 schools in 354 districts. There are a total of 393 total districts.

Writing Composition: This data is compared to the state. Though we went down in Grade 4, we are still above the state. We are catching up in Grade 7. We are just slightly below the state. We are closing the gap in Grade 10. That is a significant jump of approximately .8. This is scored on a 20. She noted 12 is the topic development. The 8 is in conventions. We also had some students who wrote off topic. This made a slight difference. The essays were written beautifully, but because off topic, these students received a zero. They could write very well, but did not stick to the topic.

Ms. Sprague explained that topic development was how well you read and understand the question and you are able to take your ideas and really expand upon them, elaborating, giving the reader a very good understanding of the direction you are going. This particular area for example one of the questions for Grade 3 was to talk about an experience you had with a favorite teacher. One of the students that wrote off topic talked about a favorite person. They did a fabulous job, wrote three pages, great

topic development, but received a zero because it was off topic. We will really focus on this aspect. The convention scores look at the appropriate use of for example punctuation and things of that nature. These two scores are then added together to get the 20.

Ms. Roy noted that off topic piece is new this year. It used to be a student was scored in the conventions. You would have at least been scored on the conventions and receive the 8 points, now a student would receive nothing.

Dr. Durkin explained as she noted Level II districts. There are 28% of the state's districts in that category, about 146.

How Do We Compare the State: Dr. Durkin noted the state comparison is important because this is the barometer and she had Ms. Roy explained what the RTTT 2014 Goal meant.

Ms. Roy explained the formatting and comparisons. She noted in bold represents where Attleboro is still higher than the state. She noted there were four areas where Attleboro is higher than the state. When the grades are combined together, we are still two points higher than the state. She noted the question being what could be categorized as a good or reasonable goal. As part of the Race to the Top, the state submitted an application. The goals were set and the federal government accepted them. It is based on individual districts. It is not for everyone. Each district receives a goal. Basically what was said is that from 2009 (which was the baseline) to 2014, in this area of proficiency, you have to make a 15% proficiency improvement. From our 2009 baseline, our goal for 2014 is 74.9% proficiency. We are currently at approximately 71. We have a 4% increase to get to in three years. We are on target. There are different groups, but this seems like a reasonable target.

Dr. Durkin stated this was set by the state for every district participating in the Race to the Top.

Ms. Roy reviewed Math noting it was the same formatting comparison. The goal here is a 15% improvement from 2009 to 2014. The target is 70.6 for Math which is a 7% improvement over the next three years which is a little more than 2% each year.

Dr. Durkin asked Ms. Sprague to address the 8<sup>th</sup> Grade issue.

Ms. Sprague stated we were very disappointed as we dropped 11%. She explained in addition to that we are facing new frameworks where the standards and expectations, we believe, will be harder. In 8<sup>th</sup> Grade we have some students who take Algebra I and other students in what is referenced as 8<sup>th</sup> Grade Math. We are currently using CMP Math for the 8<sup>th</sup> Grade Math component that we have been supplementing because this program is not one that we are very excited about. This has been discussed in the past. We do not feel this is completely aligned with the standards and we have to do a lot of additional work ensure that students are receiving what should be at the highest level of what we expect. Last year we implemented a new text for Grade 7 and removed CMP at that level. The percentage for proficient went up 10% at that level. We are not ready to request new materials for Grade 8 because of the new standards forthcoming. We are reviewing Algebra I material that needs to be infused into the Grade 8 Math program. It is a material struggle, an alignment with the standards, and the fact that the Grade 8 program under the new standards is more aligned with an Algebra I course across the board versus what we currently have. Our Math Coordinator, Linda Ferreira is really working with the math coaches and will be working with the math teachers to critically analyze the materials we are currently using and to up the game by bringing more Algebra I down into all of the Grade 8 Math.

Mr. Levinson asked how much feedback we actually get from the state on this performance. Is this information broken down by areas so that you could concentrate on these areas.

It was confirmed that this was broken down by standards. We receive an item analysis that tells us the percentage of students who answered a question correctly and how that question is aligned with the standards and which particular standard it pertains to. Ms. Sprague noted there might be three or four questions per standard and this would give us a good measurement.

Dr. Durkin noted sometimes you might have one question, not that you want to blame it on the question, you are able to look at your grade as it compares to the city and as it compares to the state. It is important information as well as all the subgroup information.

Ms. Roy noted this information can be broken down by subgroups as well. She noted the state provides the student's answer, so if they were answering it incorrectly, why was this occurring.

Mrs. Furtado asked about the current 8<sup>th</sup> Grade Algebra Math. She asked if this was the same program that was used last year.

Mrs. Sprague noted it is the same Algebra that is taught at the high school.

Mrs. Furtado asked if the 8<sup>th</sup> Grade Math last year was a little different. She asked if adjustments were made. Mrs. Furtado stated concern if there has been no change. In looking at the scores, they are concerning.

Mrs. Sprague noted both programs are being reviewed. The aim is to keep both programs the same. It is considered an Algebra I Honors. The difference between what we do in the 8<sup>th</sup> Grade and the High School is that we have to infuse some of the 8<sup>th</sup> Grade standards into the Algebra I program. We have done this over a period of time. Ms. Sprague stated she would not put Algebra I as the primary reason for those results. Ms. Sprague noted we really need to look at the other 8<sup>th</sup> Grade Algebra program and lift the standard on that program.

Mr. Stors stated looking at the results at the elementary level; it seems that other than one school, Hill-Roberts, they seem to be a little bit of an enigma. The other ones the ELA as compared to the state standards are a lot farther off than they are in Math. When you go up to the middle school, it switches and it becomes the Math where there is more of a gap between the state requirement and what the students are performing. Is there an explanation why there seems to be a switch between ELA and Math as in elementary they are doing better in the Math, but then when they get to the middle school it switches.

Ms. Roy noted this is the current state target, not performance. She noted the state is performing below the target.

Mr. Stors noted he was referencing the state requirement based on the 100% by 2014. Mr. Stors stated he was using this as his gauge. He noted for example one of our elementary schools was almost -15 off that state requirement. A couple of the others were over 10% off in ELA. While in math it was 2.9 and 3.95. When you go up to the middle schools the ELA is 3.6 and 3.3.

Dr. Durkin noted that is CPI points.

Mr. Stors confirmed that and noted the Math was 10.1 and 10.7. He stated it seems like between the elementary and middle there is a switch as to where they are having more difficulty.

Ms. Sprague noted if we were to look at last year's data, you would say the opposite. We were viewing it and surprised it reversed.

Ms. Roy noted that last year was the second year of that target. You will notice from that third page in, Math has to increase more each time the target gets raised because they started lower. She noted they have to go up eight (8) points and ELA only has to go up five (5). She noted ELA generally has a higher CPI across the state usually in the 90s and Math is generally in the mid-80s. Not only are they in the high versus very high, they have to improve eight (8) points versus the five (5). Ms. Roy noted she did not have the "golden" answer to that question.

Dr. Durkin noted this will be something we consider when we review the 4<sup>th</sup> to 5<sup>th</sup> Grade issue. What are the things that we are doing. Dr. Durkin explained the next slide contains ELA Cohort information and how kids are doing as the move forward. She noted looking at Advanced and Proficient, it increases from 2007 to 2008. She noted in 2009 we went up 17. She noted at 2011 we are at 88% of kids who started with us in Grade 5 who are proficient and advanced at the Grade 10 level. She noted the chart shows the percentages.

She noted in Math Cohorts in 2008 we went from 44 to 49; and in 2011 we are at 79. She asked the committee to notice it goes from 2009 to 2011 because in the 9<sup>th</sup> Grade there is no test.

Ms. Roy stated this is cohort which means these are roughly the same kids.

Dr. Durkin noted this answers a little bit of the question are the students making progress as they move from one grade to the next and are we increasing the number of advanced and proficient level. She noted we talk a lot about closing the achievement gap between subgroup and non-subgroup. Dr. Durkin asked Ms. Roy to explain.

Ms. Roy noted in general the subgroups normally do not perform as high as the subgroups. She noted we would have LEP and non-LEP; special ed and non-special ed. She reminded the committee of the goal that all students must get to 100%. She noted just like in ELA and Math, if you started off below, you have to improve at a much faster rate in order to get to that 100. The improvement targets are a little bit larger than they are for the non-subgroup. The gap started wider and we need to close it very quickly to get to 100. This is something we always keep our eye on. How are we working towards closing that gap. We are constantly reviewing what we are doing in closing the gap between students in the subgroup and those that are not.

2011 MCAS ELA (CPI) Gap: The goal is set by the state which is a 25% reduction in the district's 2009 baseline by 2014. The gap that was just shown, these are the numbers that we are looking at to close that gap.

Ms. Roy noted this goes back to the question is of what is reasonable. This again goes back to the Race to the Top Application which the federal government approved and these goals were set. Whatever your gap was in 2009, by 2014 you need to close it by 25%. For example in low income the score 82.9, the current gap is 9.7. Based on where we were in 2009, we were supposed to close the gap to 12.1. We have already met that goal. We have closed it to 9.7. There are some areas where we have not closed it yet. In special ed our current CPI is 70.8, the current gap between special ed and non-special ed is 22.3. We need to close it to 17.1 by 2014. In three more years we need to bring it down roughly by five (5) points.

Dr. Durkin stated she believed we could do that if we continue with the strategies we are using to close it at five and LEP also closing it by four (4). The good news is we have already managed to exceed the target in four of the seven areas.

Ms. Roy noted the last subgroup is very small.

Dr. Durkin confirmed there are very few children in the Native American subgroup. She noted in Math we have the same type of format. There is work to do in special education and LEP. Dr. Durkin noted even though we have met certain targets, we will still work to close the gap, but the targets that were set are somewhat reasonable.

Grade 10 Failure Rates: Dr. Durkin stated when we look at the failure rates, she wanted to be clear that this is proportional and this is the first attempt for students at MCAS. Students can take up to three times, she asked Mr. Newman to confirm this.

Mr. Newman they could retake it as many times as necessary to allow them to pass.

She noted every student has received an MCAS diploma. They sometimes have to take it several times. Every year, a very few number of students who do not pass the MCAS, but have demonstrated proficiency in that subject area, the Superintendent signs their name to a very important Affidavit that Mr. Sawyer generally prepares that testifies that these students have clearly met those competencies. She noted this is usually only two to three students. We have never been turned down by the state. They believe Attleboro High School is doing the right thing and the documentation is provided to support this. This is very proportional and few years ago we had a very large senior class. She explained the graph.

Ms. Sprague noted the high school deserves a lot of credit. As noted there are 12 students in ELA and 25 students in Math this year. We know that when it comes time to walk across the stage, the interventions and support mechanisms will get the number down to zero.

Science: Dr. Durkin noted we are taking these scores very seriously. We need to develop a very strong accountable plan. We need to look at what is going on in Grade K-4 and what we are doing when we get to 5<sup>th</sup> Grade.

Ms. Sprague noted the state has a 50% proficiency rate which is down three points from last year and Attleboro at 39% down six points in Grade 5. We continue struggle with the issue of science from the elementary to the middle. As you know at the elementary level and in Grades 5 and 6, we have a 90 minute ELA period and a 90 minute Math period. At the elementary level, we have added some time to the day, so we have increased the time that is allocated to science and social studies, about 15 minutes a day to those subjects. The 5<sup>th</sup> Grade science test assesses the science content in Grades 3, 4, and 5. Now we have students coming from five elementary schools into three middle schools that have had some different science experiences. In Grade 5 again we have the 90 minute math, the 90 minute ELA, a shorter science and social studies period, and teachers who are not certified science and social studies teachers. They are Math and ELA because we are really pushing to ensure our students have a solid foundation ELA, reading and writing, and mathematics. When we do professional development for our teachers at the elementary level, and Grades 5 and 6 in particular, we are focusing on ELA and Mathematics. We did have some science professional development last year, but not a lot. We have continued to review the standards and to make teachers are aware of these standards, but we are doing a lot of our science and social studies in the elementary grades integrated into the ELA and Math piece. Our curriculum is aligned with the Reading Street Program and our expectation is that there will be science beyond that integrated piece.

When we get into Grade 7 and 8 you have a science specialist. There is a different structure. You have four teachers in most cases. You have a teacher who is science certified and the professional development for those teachers if focused on science or social studies. We are seeing a slight improvement of about 36% proficiency and advanced. This is certainly not our goal which would be higher than that. We are seeing an improvement. The state went down in Grade 8 and Attleboro went up in Grade 8. The state went up in Grade 10 and Attleboro went up in Grade 10. The teachers have been working together. Ray Gousie has been working with them. He has retired; and will come back to facilitate some professional development and work on some common assessments in science so teachers get more regular feedback. She noted in Grade 5 it continues to be a challenge. She again noted in Grade 10 there are science specialists. The students are taking a test that is aligned with the course that they are taking. It is not a multi-year; it is a one course test. In Grade 8 the science that is assessed is Grades 6, 7, and 8. It is a

three-year span as it is in Grade 5. There are a lot of differences and we will continue to look at the Grade 5 issue and figure out how we can better improve performance.

Mr. DiCiaccio asked his question that referenced are we “robbing Peter to pay Paul”. Mr. DiCiaccio understands we are trying to work it into Reading Street. Reading Street was originally started to bring up our reading and writing. He noted that we have seen good results. Did we compromise science when we did this. Should we be thinking about having specialists, approaching it a different way, or just giving this more time.

Dr. Durkin noted science needs a life of its own. She noted it needs an entity and importance of its own. We need to figure out how to do that. We will be coming back to the committee with a plan.

Ms. Sprague noted these are very challenging questions. We really want our students to be incredibly strong in reading, writing, and math. We need to find a better way to enrich what we are doing because Ms. Sprague would not recommend taking away from the reading, writing, and math. The question is how we better enrich the science time that we have. We have given them a little more time this year.

Mr. DiCiaccio noted the second part of the question is when you refer to the extra time; we are not talking about time added to the day.

Ms. Sprague noted the school day was extended this year.

Mr. DiCiaccio acknowledged the additional 20 minutes. He asked if this was where the extra time was being utilized. He noted parents have asked this question.

Ms. Sprague noted the additional time was not added to ELA and Math, in the time allocation it was added to science and social studies. She noted it was not 15 minutes more per day; it was science and social studies. We had also added time for Second Step Anti-Bullying. It is a precious amount of 15 minutes spread among a number of requirements, but there is additional time for science.

Mr. Stors stated one thing he noticed was from one middle school to another, there is almost a 10% difference. He stated it are not what they what they are learning at the elementary level, it is that what they are learning at the elementary level is not equivalent. It seems like there is something different and this should be the same. There should be the same instruction at each of the five elementary schools.

Ms. Sprague noted the curriculum is the same. We did an inventory of the materials last year. We have talked about professional development. We have added some because we did not have any. In the case of this year, we do not have those two-full days of professional development. We have six (6) two (2) hour sessions of professional development. It is difficult to say that we would not do ELA this year because we have the new frameworks that need to be known for next year. It is difficult. Ms. Sprague stated professional development is an issue. Perhaps helping the teachers to provide more hands on experience as the science that you get in Reading Street is informational, but it is not digging in and getting hands on. We need to be sure that we are providing the support and materials for teachers to be able to do the hands on science at the elementary level as they are more likely to do this at the middle school level as we do have science labs, but it is more challenging at the elementary level.

Ms. Cook stressed the point that was brought up earlier that those science tests cover three years of curriculum. She noted that she was not a teacher, but stated the curriculum is so different for those three years. You are not going building upon the subject as you do in English and Math. Science the student is taking a test that covers three years of material.

Ms. Sprague noted we try to build in some review, but to capture three years of science before MCAS in Grade 5 is just not possible. She noted in Grade 8 there is a similar issue as there is three years of materials as well.

Mr. Stors noted he gets that point, but when we look at the neighboring districts. He noted it is hard to compare us to North Attleboro or Norton, but when you compare they are doing mid 80s and 90s while we are down much lower. It seems like something is not in place yet.

Dr. Durkin noted that we would be discussing comparison districts. She stated it is very important for the committee and the community to understand what we are compared to. She understands that it is easy to compare to neighboring districts meaning ones that are close to us, but there is a formula for how the state really looks at how Attleboro is doing compared to other districts.

Mr. Hill asked if we got “dinged” on the science information now.

Ms. Sprague asked what Mr. Hill meant by "dinged".

Ms. Sprague noted it is currently not part of the graduation requirement, but noted in Grade 10 we are doing fine because it is course related.

Mr. DiCiaccio stated he could tell this was important to the administration and obviously going to be a priority to everyone.

Student Growth Percentile: Dr. Durkin explained the different categories: low growth, typical growth; and high growth. She noted we have discussed the fifth grade and in most we have typical growth and in Grade 4 we have high growth in ELA. This growth is only from one year to the next. There is talk throughout the state to discuss growth over a three to five year period. This has not happened as of yet.

Ms. Roy noted what the state has put in place to answer high performing schools really high in that CPI and schools that started out lower because perhaps they had a disadvantage or perhaps higher needs, and we were still making improvement in these areas so the state put this in place. This establishes cohorts. Groups of kids that score like them and it tracks them over time; currently this is a three year group. For example how I scored two years ago, how I scored last year, and how I scored this year, my group and how I compare to them. We are looking to see if we are typical, high, or low; and the band for typical goes from 40 to 60.

Commendation Schools: Dr. Durkin noted we have two schools that were considered commendation schools. Thacher for high growth; yet Thacher struggled with AYP. Wamsutta for narrowing the proficiency gaps. Again an enigma for how the Commissioner determines commendation schools. It is important to recognize the progress we are making with that.

Ms. Sprague noted in order to be considered a commendation school; one must show consistency over a two-year period. It is not good enough to do this for one year; you must do it for two years. There are many districts that do not have any commendation schools. We are proud to have two schools in this category.

Ms. Roy noted there are roughly 120 statewide out of 1400 schools and we have two of them.

District Analysis and Review Tool (DART): It is a very viable tool referred to as DART and describes who we are and how we compare with districts across the state.

Ms. Roy noted this has not been updated yet and is based on October 1 numbers. Our numbers are not out yet. This is a precursor into how the state determines what are numbers are to comparable school based on our subgroups: low income, special education, and LEP and total enrollment; based on that formula the state puts together a group of ten schools which are listed in the chart alphabetically. The school that is deemed highest of the group is coded in blue. Your home district is coded in the orange color. In reviewing how we compare to this list, Stoughton is the highest performing district in this group. In terms of proficiency, Stoughton had 70% proficiency in ELA; we had 69%. Stoughton had 64% in Math; we had 62%. In terms of growth and how we are doing with those students and moving them forward, (40 to 60 are typical): Stoughton had 48% and we had 52% in ELA. Stoughton had 52% in Math and we had 60% in Math which borders right on high (61% is high). This again is 2010 information. We will inform the committee when the 2011 information comes out. Ms. Roy noted we are not only looking for what are reasonable targets for proficiency and closing gaps, but again what are the schools that we would compare ourselves to. The state does this for us. This is a nice tool that they came out with last year.

Dr. Durkin noted we would like to aspire to be in the top 20% in those districts. She noted our growth in math was the highest. You can also compare dropout rates, graduation rates, and it is a very effective way of looking at it to answer the question how do we compare with other districts that are like us.

What Worked: Dr. Durkin noted she would review pieces of this. In ELA: target our instructional practices and clarifying what needed to be taught, the district writing plan, how we are using professional development to calibrate expectations and instruction, working with pacing guides, trust in teacher practice beyond Reading Street, and Pre-AP training is having good effects in our middle schools.

In Math: targeted instructional practice, revisiting pacing guides, deep professional development for all teachers and paraprofessionals, analysis of program gaps and strategies to fill these gaps to meet the standards, and using time well to meet standards more effectively.

Mr. Hill asked that the targeted instruction be put in layman's terms.

Dr. Durkin noted essentially assessing what students know and do not know. How do we differentiate for students in ELL strategies, special education strategies, and closing the gap on what they need to know and what do they know. When we talk about differentiating, having groups that may be low, mid, and high achieving; the high achieving will be doing far more advanced work in terms of extending their writing pieces to be more elaborative. The lower group might be working on beginning sentence structure as well as finding evidence for what their reasons may be.

Ms. Sprague noted progress monitoring. There is assessment going on all the time in short increments of time. When you find a child is struggling, put in an intervention. It is not what subgroup are you in, it is how did do this over the last two weeks in skill and providing some additional time, some interventions, to remediate immediately, so that the student can continue to move forward. You target using assessment data and providing appropriate interventions and extra instruction for kids so that they will continue to move forward with their class.

Dr. Durkin noted this is a precursor to the Superintendent/District Goals as we look at particularly open response which is more than the long composition. How do we show evidence that are students are able to answer responsively. Inferential Reading Comprehension we are seeing vocabulary and reading beyond the line and between the lines is an area that we need to focus on early and have that targeted instruction. Our students do comprehend, but not to the depth of global comprehension. We see that effect in the 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> Grades. We need to develop curriculum documents that will go along with the standards. We need to establish a District Data and Accountability team. This will be spearheaded by the Superintendent and Ms. Roy. This will give us the voices of a number of people: principals, teachers who will make sure that the data we are collecting is effective. Does it answer our questions and how do we do this effectively. Dr. Durkin noted we have talked about the Grade 4 to 5 Transition Plan and we will report to the committee as to what this looks like as well as how do we support and stretch throughout the grades and looking at a possible lead teacher in science and social studies. We are not sure what this position would entail. This would need to be negotiated.

Mr. Stors noted an area he did not see mentioned, but will most likely come up in the Superintendent Goals. This would be school-to-school in the area of special education and ELA as an example. One school is receiving 83.9% proficiency when another is receiving a 55.7%. Mr. Stors noted he understood one school is not identical to the other school as there are higher quantities of special education. Mr. Stors stated he hoped the resources provided there would be more for the school that needs it, but if we are still having these types of separations, and those types of numbers 55.7 proficient for special education.

Dr. Durkin noted that would not change. She explained there would be progress because we are one of the few districts in this region that serves a full gamete of continuous special education students from medically fragile students all the way through to a full program of students on the autistic spectrum that begins at pre-school and goes all the way through. There are schools that have heavy preponderance of those kids with disabilities. Should they all be making progress, absolutely, but she noted there would not be dramatic leaps to 89 and 90 in special education. It does point to, similar to what the Brennan Report stated, targeting resources as to those students who may need more because they take longer to be able to do that

Mr. Stors stated that was what he was talking about. He noted nobody expects 98%. The targeting makes sense and should be part of the goals.

Dr. Durkin noted if you have children with severe language disabilities in 3<sup>rd</sup> Grade that is going to require different things than if you have children with minor learning disabilities in the 5<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> Grade. It will impact the ELA and Math, but she noted we do have schools that have a preponderance of categories. For example children with severe emotional and behavioral needs which one would say they do not have learning needs, but this has a tremendous impact on their ability to stay on task, motivation, and behavioral issues that impact not only accessing learning, but how they demonstrate that. Attleboro deserves an incredible amount of kudos because we have very small numbers of children who are in out-of-district placements. We are asked by other districts if we can serve their children. Of course we cannot. This is what makes us a strong school district in terms of having the staff to serve our children.

Mr. Hill noted that the Superintendent stated this would provide a road map for her goals. He asked the superintendent to provide some ideas with regard to support and stretching. He asked what she was thinking noting it did not have to go too in depth. He asked if that were for students or faculty.

Dr. Durkin stated support and stretching referred to students. We would be able to look at students on both ends of the continuum. Those children who are in the warning stage which requires a tremendous amount of support to close the gap. Those students at the advanced levels or proficient levels to move them to full proficiency levels and that would be a differentiation.

Mr. Stors noted his own children received their MCAS results. He noted because the results jumped this year, it was one of those jump years, the Math and ELA both went up, a lot of students last year who may have been proficient or exceeding, they are now lower. Could you address this as there is a lot of concern about this.

Ms. Sprague noted that the students scoring proficient or advanced is not really related to the Annual Yearly Progress (AYP) status which is that two (2) percent jump. The tests are different from year-to-year. So it is not really reasonable to always see consistency. If a parent has an issue or concern about a rating for example if your child went from proficient to needs improvement, or advanced to proficient, it is reasonable that they could make an appointment at their school to talk to the teacher and/or principal to find out what is going on and what is the difference. An individual student score is not reflective on that report of AYP status. That report reflects on the district and the school AYP, but does not reflect on the individual student. Ms. Sprague stated she hoped this was clear.

Mr. Levinson thanked the administration for compiling this information. He noted from a practical standpoint, it looks like the target keeps going up and we keep increasing. We are doing fairly well, but we are not obviously hitting the target because it keeps on going higher. Do you foresee any clarity coming to this within the next year or will this recur next year.

Dr. Durkin noted within the last month there has been more activity and discussion about what the No Child Left Behind is looking like. More than has been said over the last year. The wheels turn slowly. The Commissioner has to deal with his school committee as well as the public view of what this will mean. Dr. Durkin noted this still would not affect our Vision of what we want for our kids. She noted what she would really like to see is to really measure and actually report on the actual growth kids are making. When you have a kindergartener in a class with 11 languages and you enter one week, return the next week and see that student talking in sentences that cannot be captured. When you have a group of 2<sup>nd</sup> Graders who started off very low and are now achieving a benchmark for DIBELS, we can put them into 3<sup>rd</sup> Grade knowing we made a difference. Those are the kinds of capstones the Superintendent would like to see more of. Just as was mentioned about the ELL students at Studley, their growth was enormous. Their growth was larger than the state growth for ELL students. You can look at things a lot of different ways. She would like to capture that. It is very frustrating to miss those targets. They should be there, but we need to understand the challenge of we are high performing district, in the high range, and yet we are not making Adequate Yearly Progress. The term Adequate Yearly Progress is one that is challenging too.

Mr. Levinson noted he was looking through some of the gaps. One of the subgroups that caught his eye was the LEP. The gaps in the LEP is it your belief that they are having more trouble understanding the content that is being taught or is it more of a language issue or language barrier. Maybe they are understanding it and not comprehending it because of some type of language issues. How do you target this and what do you believe it is.

Ms. Sprague noted it takes someone five to seven years to develop the academic language necessary to be able to fully understand the content of a subject area. After the students are here in the country for a year, they are required to take MCAS. We know that this will not work, but that is what is required and that is what we do. As students progress in the mastery of the language, and they do, they get better they move out, and we have new students enter. That subgroup in particular is really a volatile changing group of children. We want them to improve and move out, but at the same time would like to hold them a little but do not do that. It is very challenging.

Dr. Durkin noted we quadrupled the number of teachers who are trained now in ELL strategy which is making a huge impact, but now we need to ensure the supervision part of that is giving our teachers the support that what they learned in training is now being used and being used effectively matching it to the student's needs.

Mr. DiCiaccio noted that for the community LEP stands for Limited English Proficiency. He noted Attleboro really is a "melting pot". This is a great thing, but also a challenging thing.

Mr. Hill stated as we start to plan our budget and determine where we will put resources. He asked for information reasons, do what do we plan in terms of LEP and ELL, he asked what the difference was. Is it one in the same.

English Language Learners versus Limited English Proficient is the same. Ms. Porter noted ELL is a nicer way to term this subgroup.

Mr. Hill asked if there were a dedicated full-time ELL or LEP person at each elementary school.

Ms. Sprague noted she wished there were. Changes have been made. As we looked at our growing ELL population, we have our Spanish speaking students that are new comers. There are five levels of English Language Proficiency. If you are Level I or II, when they start they go to Studley School. There are additional resources available in that school to help those students. We found we have an additional amount of students who do not speak English. Spanish is not their native language. There is a

Kindergarten class at Hyman Fine that has 11 languages. Hyman Fine is the second school where additional resources are being placed to support non-Spanish, non-English speaking students. We are shifting our resources to cover these needs. In those two schools we have a little more support, certainly not as much as we would like at Hyman Fine.

Mr. Hill asked if this was a .2 or a .6 person.

Ms. Sprague noted we have a full-time kindergarten teacher that is ESL certified at Hyman Fine and at Studley. We have an additional .5 at Hyman Fine, and an additional 1.0 at Studley. Hyman Fine just started that strand. We have more students and will need to increase this at Hyman Fine. At the other schools, it is approximately .5 teacher, it is not a paraprofessional it is a teacher that is ESL certified.

Mr. DiCiccio noted the meeting was running long. He again encouraged other members to ask questions next Monday night at the meeting.

Mr. Stors noted his question pertained to the No Child Left Behind Status for each of the schools. For ELA and Math there is really two areas. There is the aggregate which is the overall and then we have the subgroups, but when you get a status there is only one status. Often it is Improving Year 2 Subgroups Corrective Action Subgroups. The question is if the aggregate did not meet the requirement as far as the status, which would take the status.

Ms. Roy noted if you have any of them that does not make it, you receive a status. If your aggregate makes it and your subgroup does not, you will receive the status and it will state for subgroups.

Mr. Stors stated what if both did not meet the requirement. Aggregate and subgroups, would aggregate override the subgroups.

Ms. Roy stated yes, but you will see that the subgroup does not make it

Mr. Stors asked if you would have two statuses.

Ms. Roy noted she has never seen this, but will check this out.

Mr. Stors noted if the aggregate had, they would be in Improvement Year 1 while versus the subgroups, they have been.

Ms. Roy stated you would get the one.

Mr. Stors noted for example one of our schools is corrective action. If they did not meet it for the aggregate, then it would become corrective action and instead of subgroups it would be aggregate.

Ms. Roy agreed, but noted it usually just states Corrective Action.

Dr. Durkin noted if there is no word for subgroups, they would specify this.

Ms. Roy stated you could be in Corrective Action for your subgroup special ed, make the progress out of there and then all of the sudden your LEP goes in. You are still in Corrective Action, no differentiation. She noted it will either say Corrective Action with nothing or Corrective Action with the Subgroup name.

No Child Left Behind: Dr. Durkin noted the question about this is very much related to the issue of how Massachusetts will get a "waiver" and how individual school districts will get these "waivers." One of the key elements was about how teachers will be evaluated. We are fortunate in Attleboro to have worked on an Evaluation Tool for a long period of time. We are in our third year of this negotiated tool. Part of the Early Adopter/Adapter status is about having been selected by the state to be one of ten (10) school districts to that will be a voice and be able to take the new state regulations and see how they fit into our tool, be able to adapt that tool, and adapt the regulation. In June we had very little information about the term Early Adopter/Adapter. This was on a previous Agenda, was removed, and now we are back with more information. We have been working very closely with the AEA leadership and staff for us to be fully compliant to the Early Adopter/Adapter stage. The Superintendent met today with the AEA Leadership Team to work on moving this process forward. This week there is a consultant coming in from the DESE to meet with the administration and members of the AEA. Dr. Durkin noted Attleboro plans to be a very loud voice in this process because they are excited about what we have done and what they can learn from us. It is a great opportunity and the state is very open to hearing from us.

Dr. Durkin asked the Chairman after working with the staff and AEA Leadership, if next week she may bring back the recommendation to the committee. She will provide the updated material to the committee in the packet.

Mr. Stors asked if for that report, the superintendent would be explaining the process of the waivers.

Dr. Durkin noted not the waivers, but what it means to be an Early Adopter/Adapter.

Mr. Stors asked if he may go back to the waiver. He noted it was his understanding that what it would be doing is the federal government is stating that if you adopt our idea of an evaluation tool, then we might give you a waiver.

Ms. Sprague asked if Mr. Stors was referencing an AYP waiver.

Mr. Stors confirmed that he was.

Dr. Durkin noted the state will first have a discussion as to what they would be committing to, and then it would come to us as a district. She noted the good part about it is that Massachusetts has kind of been in front of this by clearly stating the teacher evaluation is clearly an important component and working with all the entities to make this happen. Dr. Durkin did glance at the flexibility document that the state would have to forward in. This is a 30 page document. This contains lots of questions such as the one by Mr. Stors. The Commissioner would need to do that and hopefully he will use information from the group of Early Adopter/Adapters to decide in terms of what might be helpful.

Mr. Stors noted the only reason he was bringing this up is that the Evaluation Tool seemed to be linked to the waiver.

Dr. Durkin noted among other things. She stated that she wanted to be clear that the Early Adopter/Adapter status came out last year and just so happens that now it is correlating with this. Dr. Durkin noted we have a lot to gain from this. She thanked the teachers and the AEA Leadership for working on this. It is a process to understand what this will mean for us. We were not ready to commit to it until we understood what does it mean for Attleboro. Dr. Durkin noted that there also might be an indication of \$10,000 to \$15,000 that we will try to attain from the feds to have that money come into the district to use for the work.

Mr. DiCiaccio asked if that would be part of the Race to the Top.

Dr. Durkin noted it would be an additional addendum in the form of another grant. This was discussed in August, we have not heard any more, but will continue to inquire.

Personnel Report: Nancy Sprague, Director for Teaching and Learning Excellence (Administration Report): Ms. Sprague reported three (3) resignations; and five (5) appointments (see attached School Committee Personnel Report attached hereto and therefore made a part hereof).

## Committee Reports

### Finance, Facilities and Procurement Sub-Committee

Ms. Cook reported to the committee on the meeting held on 09-21-11. The first item was to review the monthly budget reports. It is very early in the fiscal year. It was noted that most data anomalies is that staff has not yet been assigned to grant money, but this should be realigned shortly. It was noted some large vendor items are coming up for renewal in 2012. The Business Manager, Marc Furtado suggested the committee consider extending the contract period of some of these contracts over the three year maximum. There is a three contract maximum set by our municipal charter. Some ideas that were floated were extending the grounds and transportation contracts to possibly five years and the facilities to maybe ten. This would allow companies bidding to reduce their overhead, their costs associated with the bid process, and allow for a maturation of the equipment for companies who buy equipment. The sub-committee discussed and agreed this was an idea worth exploring, but wanted to do further research ourselves and discuss this at the October meeting. If the sub-committee does agree to vote this in concept it will be brought up to the full committee for vote and then be brought to the municipal council for review and vote as well.

The City Auditor noted that a vote by the committee is required in order to set up the gifts and grants account. There was a motion to vote and authorize to approve the expenditure of funds from the gifts and grants that have been received by the school department for educational purposes. The expenditures so authorized must be for the purposes consistent with the terms of the gift or grant. For so-called entitlement grants this authorization will extend until revoked by the School Committee. For competitive grants this authorization will need to be renewed annually. She noted the motion was on the table. Ms. Cook asked if there were any further discussion. There was no discussion. Vote: 8-0. Motion passes.

The last item was a Central Parent versus individual PTO organizations. The Central Parent Organization in our district has been inactive for several years and this has implications to some individual school PTO. Mr. Furtado stated he will make the appropriate returns to reverse the inactive status as well as start conversations with various school PTO's to gather data about the best most cost effective way to move forward in terms of the structures for PTOs going forward. Ms. Cook explained her understanding of the Central Parent Association. The sub-committee felt it was important to review all the data, talk to the stakeholders, and review the liabilities to the district if any and assess all pros and cons.

Mr. Furtado stated he had e-mailed all of the non-profit entities such as PTOs and for instance Hockey Booster Club. He has heard back from half of the group. He had questions answered for example do you have a charter, what is the filing status, etc. He has heard back from 6 of the 14 groups. Some groups are totally up-to-date; others have not filed in many years. He expects to receive a mixed bag back. They tried to set up a common meeting time; this has not worked well as these are very busy people. We will attempt to have a fruitful discussion as to the pros and cons from their perspective. Mr. Furtado will continue to gather the basic information. He believes not too many of the groups have done formal auditing to-date.

#### Notification of Bills and Warrants

5BS008 – 09-02-11 - \$ 95,623.33  
5BS009 – 09-07-11 - \$ 17,308.97  
5BS010 – 09-14-11 - \$178,104.56  
5BS011 – 09-21-11 - \$527,533.82

The next meeting will be held on 10-19-11 @ 6:30 p.m.

#### Curriculum and Instruction Sub-Committee:

Mr. Levinson not a meeting was held on 09-15-11. Brief break down, we saw the slide show without the data, discussion of waiver, subgroups, and aggregate. We talked about the 100% by 2014. We discussed the different subgroups noting approximately 31% of Attleboro can be characterized in the low income subgroup. A discussion was held about the Race to the Top goals and how they are a little bit more achievable than the state's by 2014. We discussed the weaknesses in the science and technology fields. The presentation was the shell without the data that was presented tonight to the committee. The next meeting will be held on October 18<sup>th</sup> at 6:30 p.m.

#### Policy Sub-Committee

Mr. Stors updated the committee on the meeting that was held on 09-19-11. He noted the Wellness Policy was discussed as it pertained to the beverage section at the middle schools. The superintendent updated the committee on this process. The state guidelines recommend water. The question had to do if all the schools were following the same policy or were individual determinations being made. We did not want, as the superintendent provided in her update, policing of what students are bringing.

Mr. Stors explained the process for the Concussion Policy. What we had gone through at the start of the school year for our athletes. We do have a concussion policy coming forward. He stated before this can be voted, we need to determine the file designation. We are pretty sure this would fall under the student section or Section J. Mr. Stors researched this. No one appears to have a proper designation at this time. MASC was unable to provide a designation as well. The Concussion Policy is fairly new. There are schools with a policy in place, but are unsure of the proper designation. Mr. Stors recommended designation JJI – Student Athletics. This seems to be the appropriate section. He noted looking a little bit further; there is extra-curricular eligibility. Mr. Stors explained the concussion policy does pertain to eligibility wherein if a student is injured they need to go through a series of re-entry tests to be eligible to play. This would be Section JJJ. He noted the two areas that seem most likely are JJI or JJJ. He noted the designation would be either JJIB-A or JJJ-A.

Mr. Levinson noted that Mr. Stors had stated he reached out to MASC. Mr. Levinson stated he assumed most of the districts would start to adopt a policy similar to this as it is a hot topic right now. He asked if we could approve it under a miscellaneous area until MASC provides some direction so that we do not have to re-classify down the road.

Mr. Stors noted one way or another we will have to re-classify it down the road. We noted it would be best to put it where we feel it fits best at this time and then if we need to we can re-classify it later. MASC does have a boiler plate policy that they have developed and a lot of school districts have this in place at this time. He stated our professional staff came forward with this policy and we would like to move forward with it.

Mr. Stors recommendation would be JJJ-A which would be Head Injury and Concussion Policy. It puts it in the appropriate place, gets it into the book, and then if a few months down the road a different designation is announced, we can always bring that forward.

Ms. Furtado asked what JJI was.

Mr. Stors noted student athletics. JJIA is intramural sports. JJIB is interscholastic sports. JJIC – eligibility and minimum standards for participation. JJID is student physicals for student athletes.

Ms. Furtado stated she preferred the JJI Section.

Mr. Stors noted then we would need the subsection.

Mr. DiCiaccio asked why.

Mr. Stors explained the procedure noting it was set up by the National School Boards. He stated it could be JJIB-A which would be under the interscholastic sports with the sub-category of head injury and concussion policy.

Motion as made to approve Policy JJIB-A as presented by the Administration: Discussion; None: Vote: 8-0. Motion is tabled.

BEC – Executive Session: We were waiting for the term majority to be defined as our legal counsel disagreed with MASC. We were waiting for a definition of majority as to whether it stemmed from the majority of full committee or majority of those present. We have been waiting for a full definition from the Attorney General's Office. We wanted to make sure we were following the law to go into Executive Session and using the right motions to do so. Mr. Stors noted the importance noting some districts have been in trouble for doing this incorrectly. We did not want to continue to wait.

The recommendation came from Mr. Hill that we go with the more stringent of the two for now and then when an answer is provided by the Attorney General's Office, we could revisit this. The members have both BEC and BEC-E1 Recommended Motions for Executive Sessions.

Mr. Stors noted a motion has been brought up from the sub-committee to approve these policies. He asked if there were any further discussion.

Mr. Levinson noted on page one at the bottom the reference of council needs to be changed to counsel.

Mr. Stors noted minor changes were made for example his/her was added. In addition there was additional information put in regarding going into Executive Session. The only reason for us would be the hiring of the Superintendent. There was a request for clarification, which we did. He explained under #8 to consider or review applicants for employment or appointment to the district superintendency because as far as the committee is concerned this would be the only case that would apply to this situation. Everything else comes from the Superintendent as a recommendation to the Committee.

Ms. Cook asked whose recommendation are we going to follow.

Mr. Stors noted this is MASC's recommendation in which they state a majority of all members (under number four). In the case of the Attleboro School Committee this would be five of 9. Mr. Stors noted our legal counsel, who believes other legal counsels agree with him, is recommending it should be of the majority of members present at a meeting. The way it is worded it seems to imply of the full body whether present or not.

Mr. DiCiaccio stated then it would be a majority no matter what.

Mr. Stors noted if we only had seven present, Attorney Lenox believes a vote of four would get you into Executive Session. MASC is stating it would have to be five of the nine members.

Mr. Stors noted the committee felt it is not something that will come into play often, if at all. He stated if the Chairman informs the committee of a need to go into Executive Session, more often or not the full committee is in agreement. He noted the belief was that we should go with the most stringent requirement to protect ourselves.

Mr. Hill noted if you were to go into executive session with four votes, and later on it is determined it is the higher standard, then it could be determined to be an invalid reason. This will protect the committee.

Mr. Levinson argued counter to that. He stated we are actually more protected if we vote with our counsel's recommendation because in that case it gives us legal coverage. If there is a situation where we have seven people and only four want to go into Executive Session, under this policy, technically we cannot go into Executive Session, but under our counsel's interpretation of the law and what he believes as do other counsels as was earlier said, technically we should be able to go into Executive Session for that purpose.

Mr. Stors noted the difficulty here is if MASC is right, then and we go into Executive Session with four of seven votes, then we are violating the law. If we go with what we have here and our attorney and other attorneys are incorrect, and the Attorney General rules five of the nine, then we are protected.

Mr. Levinson noted either way, we could have a situation where we need to go into Executive Session. He stated he was a little hesitant that we have the recommendation in front of us that is not the recommendation of our counsel.

Mr. Stors noted when he spoke with counsel; he did not state this was negative to put this requirement forward. It is a little more stringent. It does not make us in violation of the law in any way; we are just being more stringent. He indicated it was a little more of a lax requirement than what MASC believes. Mr. Stors noted we have been waiting for months for the Attorney General's Office to release a decision.

Mr. DiCiaccio voiced his concerns. He noted we do go into Executive Sessions and there is often a need to. Sometimes it is hard for people to make meetings. If there is not a majority, we will not be able to hold these Executive Sessions according to this policy.

Mr. Hill noted if you cannot get five people to attend an Executive Session, the committee probably should not be entering Executive Session.

Mr. Levinson stated this could also be against Massachusetts Law that when it comes down and states that you only need four. He stated our counsel is paid to give us an interpretation. His interpretation is not what we are going forward with at this time

Mr. Stors noted counsel did not have anything negative to say about this.

Mr. Levinson asked that the committee table this until Monday in order to see what Counsel has recommended; a statement in writing from our Counsel. Mr. Levinson stated you are in a very dangerous area when your counsel is telling you one thing and you are doing something else.

Mr. Stors noted what counsel said was that the way that he and other co-legal counsels state is they read the law and interpret it as four. If we go with a requirement of five which is the other interpretation, it does not hurt us in any way. He stated there is no liability to do that.

Mr. Levinson noted there can be in a situation if we do not have seven people present and four want to go into Executive Session and you should be going into Executive Session that is where we lose.

Mr. Stors stated then you would not be able to go into Executive Session.

Mr. Levinson noted if our counsel is correct we do have a right to enter into Executive Session. Mr. Levinson noted he agreed with counsel. He would take Attorney Lenox' recommendation one way or the other and if we are supposed to go into Executive Session with four votes and we are now adopting a policy that is against Massachusetts Law, we have a much bigger problem. We have counsel who has given us his interpretation of the law. We should go with our counsel's advice.

Mr. Stors noted he should point out that he did agree that MASC's legal counsel interprets the other way. He then noted it was not his decision, it would be the decision of the Attorney General's Office. Attorney Lenox has been in contact with the Attorney General's Office and they have not come forward with a decision.

Mr. Levinson noted MASC is a good organization, but we do not answer to MASC. We answer to our counsel who we hired to give us legal advice.

Mr. DiCiaccio stated where we have a meeting next Monday, perhaps we should wait.

Mr. Hill stated he did not want to incur any further legal bills.

Mr. Stors noted the way the e-mails from counsel were left was that the final decision would be made by the Attorney General's Office. This is a difficult situation, but the sub-committee felt that Mr. Hill's recommendation to go with the more stringent going with the 5 of 9 would protect the committee. Mr. Stors noted the motion was on the floor to approve BEC and BEC-E1 as provided:

Mr. DiCiaccio asked where BEC-E1 came from.

Mr. Stors noted when the new Open Meeting Laws came out MASC provided this information. We reviewed this and thought this would be helpful to the Chairman using the correct terminology as other districts have gotten into trouble for entering into Executive Sessions for the wrong reasons. Vote: 6-2-0 (DiCiaccio and Levinson)

Job Description: Business Manager: Dr. Durkin explained the changes that were made to the current job description and the reasons for them (see job description attached hereto and therefore made a part hereof).

Ms. Cook asked why these changes were made.

Dr. Durkin noted the original was done before Mr. Furtado came on board. This gives the specificity of the job requirements.

Ms. Cook questioned the qualities asking if the Superintendent felt this might hamper anything.

Dr. Durkin noted the negotiation factors is a critical part of this position regardless and the committee dictates how broad this might be. She did not feel that was a problem.

Motion was made to approve the Job Description as presented by the administration: Vote: 8-0. Motion passes.

Meeting adjourned at 10:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jim Stors, Secretary

Attachments:

1. Agenda dated 09-26-11
2. School Sponsored Events – 09-26-11
3. Power Point MCAS/AYP Information
4. School Committee Personnel Report 09-26-11
5. Draft Finance Sub-Committee Minutes
6. Warrant: 5BS008
7. Warrant: 5BS009
8. Warrant: 5BS010
9. Warrant: 5BS011
10. Job Description: Business Manager
11. Policy BEC
12. Policy BEC-E1
13. Draft Policy Head Injury and Concussion
14. Information provided by Ms. Crawder