

Attleboro Public Schools
Attleboro, Massachusetts
School Committee Meeting
Monday, September 24, 2012 @ 7:00 p.m.
School Committee Conference Room - Attleboro High School
Minutes

Present: Michael Tyler, (At Large), Chairman, Barbara Craw, (At-Large), Secretary, William Larson, (Ward II), Christopher O'Neil (Ward III), Frances Zito, (Ward V), Kenneth Parent, (Ward VI), David Murphy, (At Large)

Absent: Teri Enegren, (Ward I) and Brenda Furtado (Ward IV)

Also Present: Pia Durkin, Ph.D., Superintendent, Dave Sawyer, Assistant Superintendent, Tom Rose, Business Manager, Marisa McCarthy, Director of Special Education and Student Support Services, Student Representative, Keith Drucker, and Judy Nelson, Recording Secretary.

The meeting was called to order at 7:02 p.m.

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

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

Moment of Silence: Moment of Silence: A Moment of Silence was held for Marilyn Rigby a senior clerk typist for 33 years from 1968 to 2001 for Attleboro Public Schools.

Community Update: School Sponsored Events: Chairman Tyler welcomed student representative, Keith Drucker. Mr. Drucker updated the committee on the school sponsored events (attached hereto and therefore made a part hereof).

Minutes: 09-10-12: A motion was made to approve the School Committee Minutes from the meeting held on September 10, 2012 as presented: Discussion: None: Vote: 7-0

Open Forum: Mr. Tyler explained the guidelines of Open Forum. There were no participants.

Consent Agenda:

A motion was made to accept a donation in the amount of \$413.30 to the Hill-Roberts gifts/donation line from the Target's Take Charge of Education Program: Discussion: None: Vote: 7-0

A motion was made to accept a donation in the amount of \$335.69 to the Brennan Middle School gifts/donation line from the Target's Take Charge of Education Program: Discussion: None: Vote: 7-0

A motion was made to accept a donation in the amount of \$205.48 to the Coelho Middle School gifts/donation line from the Target's Take Charge of Education Program: Discussion: None: Vote: 7-0

A motion was made to accept a donation in the amount of \$1,044.35 to Attleboro High School gifts/donation line from the Target's Take Charge of Education Program: Discussion: None: Vote: 7-0

A motion was made to accept the donation of an Epson 7000 Wide Format Printer with an estimated value of \$2,500 and four (4) 3-door file cabinets (a value to be determined) to Attleboro High School from Joseph Bobola owner of OPS Printing located in North Attleboro: Discussion: None: Vote: 7-0

New Business:

Attleboro Special Education Parent Advisory Council (ASEPAC): (Power Point attached hereto and therefore made a part hereof). The members introduced themselves and their affiliation with the group. The purpose of the Parent Advisory Council and the requirements of the Department of Education were explained. ASEPAC provides support to parents of students with special

education needs; advises the school committee about the education and well being of students with disabilities. ASEPAC educates and promotes awareness regarding special educational services provided to all eligible students in the school system. This is a group of dedicated parents working to improve the quality of special education services within the Attleboro School District and can be used as a resource when concerned parents contact the school committee seeking assistance with their special education needs. The Mission Statement; to facilitate understanding, respect, and support for all children with special education needs in our community. The members explained their membership; what they do; the activities available, and their goals and recommendations for the district. There are events held monthly. Parents were encouraged to attend. This information will be available on the website. The website should be functional shortly. ASEPAC can be reached via e-mail @ ASEPAC@ymail.com or voicemail message can be left at 508-222-0012 extension 444.

Mr. Parent reiterated this information is available to all parents. The brochures are accessible at each school and in central office. Mr. Parent noted the website was in process and will be very helpful.

Ms. Craw thanked ASEPAC for all the information and the services they provide to the parents. Ms. Craw has accessed this information and has found it quite helpful.

Mr. O'Neil inquired about assistive technology.

Ms. McCarthy explained that assistive technology is anything that supports a student such as a writing tool and/or communication technology.

Mr. Murphy commended the increased communication and asked if there were anything the school committee could do to get the information out. The importance of involving parents in the early stages of their child's learning was stressed and he asked the superintendent to keep the school committee informed.

Dr. Durkin noted information is provided through school newsletters, flyers, and will be on the ASEPAC website. The website will be a good resource for parents. The superintendent commended this group on helping people understand the resources and information available to them. Special Education has been kept at the forefront.

2012 Achievement Data: Pia Durkin, Ph.D., Superintendent; Dave Sawyer, Assistant Superintendent; Michelle Roy, Data and Accountability Coordinator: (PowerPoint attached hereto and therefore made a part hereof).

Dr. Durkin noted the good news does not overshadow the challenges ahead. There is a new accountability system noting the challenge of keeping up with this pace. Dr. Durkin stated the district accomplishment and the importance of continuous improvement beginning from the Superintendent down to all members of staff. Attleboro received good news, but the work is never done. The presentation outlined how Attleboro got where it is and what needs to be done to get better. The role of the Data and Accountability Coordinator is one who reviews the data and makes it succinct enough to assist the principals. Data is only good if it can be used.

The presentation provided an overview of the 2012 MCAS accountability results for Attleboro Public Schools, shared the progress made by the district and its schools, discussed the results of the district/school improvement strategies, and reviewed the next steps for continued progress. Dr. Durkin noted as we get higher up on the trajectory it becomes more difficult. Dr. Durkin gave an analogy of the process for example: when a district moves up one percent (1%) as we did in English Language Arts it is not as simple. Dr. Durkin explained why the district compares itself to the state as this provides a barometer that is the lowest minimum threshold. Attleboro needs to be minimally if not better than the average across the state.

In English Language Arts and Mathematics, Attleboro students scored above the state average. In six of the seven grade levels the percentage of students scoring proficient or above in English Language Arts and Mathematics are above the state average.

ELA: In 3rd Grade Attleboro went down. The administration is not happy. We are above the state, but we are not sure what occurred. In math there is a more dramatic drop which is being reviewed very carefully. The administration believes the new Common Core Standards are "kicking in" and the format of the test has changed. We need to prepare our children better when they are faced with for example a math problem that might look different or a type of reading exercise that may involve more inferential comprehension which involves reading between the lines rather than reading the lines. In Grade 5 no progress was made, in comparison, the state went down. Grade 6 went down; we are researching more information about the 6th Grade test across the state. Grade 8 students seem to be accelerating.

Math: Grade 3 represents a real change for Attleboro. One that needs to be reviewed, although we are above the state, we need to review where the decreases and increases occurred. In Grade 6 we are 8% points above the state, but we did drop 2%. Grade 8 did well. In looking at the accelerating we are wondering did we form the foundation in Grade 7 that allowed Grade 8 students to do so well. Attleboro is far above the state in that area. For all grade levels with the exception of Grade 10 we are above the state.

Science/Technology: The percentage of students scoring proficient or above in science/technology showed gains in all three grade levels, but are slightly below the state average at the Grade 5 and high school level. Attleboro made considerable progress going up 12% points in Grade 5. There were specific strategies used in Grade 5. Science which are being reviewed; this test involves science learned from Grades 1-5. We need to do a better job of concretizing, but are pleased that scores went up as much as they did. In Grade 8, same scenario; there are three gap grades in between Grades 6, 7 and 8. In the high school we are also making changes.

The growth percentile demonstrates how Attleboro's students learned over the year; what a student came in with, are they learning by making high growth and/or accelerated growth over the year; or is it typical or low. Every parent would like their child to make minimally one year's progress.

Mr. Sawyer noted one of the pitfalls of achievement data is that we are often comparing two different groups of students. For example when we look at this year's data compared to last year's data, we are comparing two different groups of students. There are many problems involved with comparing two groups of students. The state created the growth percentile as a way of trying to compare "apples to apples" and what the growth measure does is creates groups of what is known as academic peers. All the students who have the exact same score history, that is going back on previous tests, are grouped together. They were put in a line from the lowest score to the highest score, and a percentile ranking was created. For example: perhaps 50 would be the average score for this group. Students are then placed along a line. Fifty would be the median which is known as typical growth. The statistics behind the growth measure is that anything less than ten points is not statistically significant. This is why typical growth is considered between 40-60 (ten points on either side of 50; the average student). This allows one to compare other students like that student. Schools are given their SGP ranking as the median for that school. All students are assigned an SGP number. The school's SGP number would be the median for all the students in that school. This can also be done for a district across an entire grade. The good news being there are no low growth grades for Attleboro Public Schools. There is typical or high growth seen.

Dr. Durkin noted there is no growth for Grade 3 because students do not have a year to look back on.

Mr. Sawyer explained the comparable district graph. The district would like to see high growth/high achievement because which means not only are your students scoring well; they are growing at a high rate as well. The district wants to be located in the northeast quadrant. The last place a district wants to be is in the southwest (low growth). The district looks for high growth/high achievement. The comparable districts were charted on this graph as defined by the DART information provided from the state last year. The DART data for the 2012 data is not available at this time. The district data is available state-wide, which allows us to review the other communities. We have plotted their scores against Attleboro's to provide a look at how Attleboro compares with like-districts determined by the state. Attleboro is in the top half, where we want to be.

Attleboro Public Schools exhibited typical to high growth for all 14 levels. The comparable district plot was discussed in ELA and Math. The cohort performance in ELA and Math was broken down for the current junior class. The five year trends in ELA and Math performance (2008-12) were discussed with gains in achievement at all seven grades which is outpacing the state. It was noted there is no growth data to compare our third graders to at this time. In ELA we are off being in the top right quadrant by 1%. Compared to other districts, Attleboro is doing well. In Math, we have even better news. Attleboro is in the top right quadrant. We are the highest achieving district of the comparable districts.

Mr. Sawyer explained the cohort performance graphs: this is a group of students who has stayed with Attleboro. This graph shows the Grade 10 2012 students (juniors this year). This graph charts the results back to fifth grade. There is a definite trend. In ELA: an increase in the number of students scoring advanced/proficient and a decrease in students scoring needs improvement and/or warning/failing. These students over time have moved up toward advanced/proficient. Math: shows a similar picture.

Mr. Parent questioned both the drop in 3rd and 6th Grade data. Mr. Parent asked if this has been isolated by school.

Dr. Durkin explained that this is the district data. There are some schools with promising data and other schools with drops. This data is available by school. The school data is being reviewed and broken down by grade. This allows us to match across and see why one school did well and one did not. The schools are holding grade level meetings and coaches meeting to discuss and plan for what needs to be done to better prepare our children. Dr. Durkin noted the third grade data is fairly pervasive. Dr. Durkin noted concerns across different districts as to what happened to Grade 3 because across the states something happened as well. We do not blame the test, but when you change the format and up the anti- this can make a difference with children who have never sat through this test before. This will be reviewed, dissected, and a plan put in place to better prepare our children.

Dr. Durkin noted the following information shows the five-year trends which represent sustainability and represent a systemic change. In deference to Mr. Parent's question, what this shows is that all grades over the period of five years have made significant gains in the number of children in advanced/proficient regardless of the school, regardless of the year and/or teacher. Systemically across the board Attleboro is making strides. In 2012, 4,722 Attleboro students scored a proficient or higher in ELA; and about 3,857 students in Math. As compared to 2008 where there were 619 students less scoring in in ELA and 743 less in Math. If you divide that out by five on an average every year, 123 students got better in ELA and 150 in Math. That is a momentum that is extremely important to recognize and validate. This is not just about one grade or one school; it is about a system change. This not only shows momentum, but shows this can be sustained. In ELA the state has changed 13%

The Progress and Performance Index (PPI) combines information about narrowing proficiency gaps, growth, and graduation and drop out rates into a single number. All districts, schools, and groups with sufficient data are assigned an annual PPI and a PPI cumulative. The new accountability system requires the districts: to narrow the proficiency gap by half by 2016-17; accountability and assistant levels are 1-5; progress and performance index (PPI) – 100 points; addition of high needs subgroup; school percentiles 1-99 reported; and the new formula is based on student proficiency (CPI) student growth percentiles (SGP); and graduation and dropout rates (high school only). The PPI Core Indicators and calculations were explained. Attleboro's Accountability Data was broken down. Attleboro met seven (7) of the ten (10) targets for 2012. A plan is in place for high needs and special education, the areas that did not meet target. Attleboro is making progress which can be attributed to our teacher practice; how we look at student achievement; and the ability to break down the reasons when students are not achieving. All seven grade levels outpaced the state in ELA. The same trend in math with an even more dramatic difference with the exception of Grade 3, this is in double digits. Attleboro started further behind. We are accelerating, but still need to do things that work well, provide leverage, and allow us to catch up. This is good news for all students Pre-K through 12.

Dr. Durkin noted there are new acronyms being used. The big picture is that it is a better accountability system for a couple of reasons one being: it allows for growth. This is why we are in public education to make differences in children's lives. We get children who have not been in school before, cannot speak English, and/or might have a disability, and we help them achieve and grow just as much as their non-disabled peers or neighbors who speak English. This is the beauty of public education. We take students and push them to achieve better allowing them to have opportunities that they might not have had. It allows for growth and counts with all children. This will be reviewed without penalizing subgroups against one another.

Ms. Roy explained we used to have Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) which was a measure of CPI (composite performance index) which meant we got points for how students scored and then we were given the average based on that. It was only based on students that were advanced, proficient, needs improvement, or warning. We never received data on whether or not those students were growing compared to students like them. The state slowly rolled out the growth factor. As part of the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) waiver, the new system was proposed which takes into account the narrowing of the proficiency gap. Which is strictly the CPI piece; and how we can cut the gap between where we are now and 100; and cutting that in half by the year 2017. It blends in the growth data in ELA and Math. We do not have growth data in science at this time. It did add science into the CPI piece which we did not have before. Science is a blend, but only of the gap-narrowing piece, not the growth. It also adds two other indicators for the high school: graduation rate and dropout rate. It blends anywhere to 4-5-7 of those factors together into a single number for an annual score and into a cumulative number for four years. We receive this information based on a target that the state has set for us.

Ms. Roy explained the formula as follows: take the proficiency gap [which is strictly the CPI (each student receives a number based on their score)]; average that, cut all students/groups of students the distance from where they were in 2011 to 2017; and cut that in half in each of those subgroups. The number is derived from where we are to 100 and cut in half and divided by six years. The old terms "restructuring;" or "schools in needs of improvement;" these have been replaced by the assistance levels (Levels 1-5). A high needs subgroup was added because there were a lot of schools across the state that did not have a large enough group in some of the categories such as ELL or special education to qualify for information from the state. The state

created a "super subgroup" which includes; low income, special education, and ELL. The subgroup minimum was lowered from 40 to 30; in doing this, about 262 schools now get ratings in these areas. Schools, in the past, who received no information, now receive the information for the past four years. Attleboro was lucky enough to have this information to allow us to review the interventions that were working. In the past, (special education, low income), a student could be in more than one subgroup, and counted more than once. The high needs group is unduplicated; now if you are in one of these groups you are counted as one student.

Dr. Durkin noted Attleboro is at 45% high needs.

Ms. Roy explained students in Grades 3, 8, and 10 who were assessed: 45% of them were high needs; which meant they fell in one or more of those three categories (special education, low income, or ELL); which is pretty high.

Ms. Roy reviewed the accountability and assistance levels explaining (Levels 1-5). Level 3, receives extra assistance from the state, and is in the bottom 20% of the state. If a school is in the top ten percent, they would qualify for a commended school. The new formula includes CPI, the gap narrowing piece, growth (student growth percentile), and the two indicators for the high school only (graduation rate and dropout rate). Ms. Roy noted if the school is a high school, all 7 would apply; middle school would have 5 elements; and elementary does not have the science element (Slide 16). This would provide the yearly total. To compute the cumulative total (this involves four years): the state weighs the most recent year the most: 2012=40%; 2011=30%; 2010=20%; and 2009=10%. This total 100 and you would divide that number by 10.

Mr. Tyler asked if there were two different categories for graduation rate.

Ms. Roy noted there are two different targets. The five year includes the students that for the following year. To meet this, the goal is actually set 5% higher. The target this year for the four-year graduation rate is 75% and the target for the five-year graduation rate is 80%. Ms. Roy explained there are several intricate pieces; this presentation provides an overview.

Mr. Larson asked for clarification on the combination formula for students from 2009-2012: what if a student was not here for a couple of years.

Ms. Roy explained, in order to figure the growth part, a student had to have been here for two prior years for this information to be available for calculation. If you were in another Massachusetts school, the student would have a growth score and that would be forwarded to Attleboro.

Mr. Larson noted if the student were from out-of-state how would that figure in.

Ms. Roy reiterated that a student has to be a Massachusetts student; if not, the student would not be included. If a subgroup, during one of those years, was not big enough, you would not get information for that year. In that case, you would divide by the number of years provided.

Mr. Larson stated they make adjustments for this.

Ms. Roy confirmed that the state does consider these adjustments.

Dr. Durkin noted the cumulative PPI reminds the district continued improvement is needed. It allows a district to go forward from a bad year, but reminds them of the need to keep improving.

Ms. Roy stated there is no way around the formula; the district needs continuous progress to decrease the gap. This information and the cohort information is blended together; and as noted the most recent year counts the most.

Attleboro Accountability Data: (Slide 17): Ms. Roy reiterated there are not separate scores for ELA and Math; they both go together. Ms. Roy explained the only two categories that count for these level ratings are the top two (all students and the high need group). Information is provided on the remainder to inform us which part of the high needs group (low income, ELL, and low income) may be struggling. The bottom three, inform us of our students backgrounds are meeting targets or not. The only two the state looks at for assigning our levels are all students and high needs. This is cumulative (four years). The target is 75 which means on target. Any number above that means we are above. All needs met its target: 85 (state target 75); the high needs was

72 (state: 75); did not meet the target. The groups that make this up: low income was 72: ELL/FELL was 85: SPED was 51: all the other groups met or surpassed the targets.

Dr. Durkin noted with regard to the special education group, the district has formed a K-12 work group. We will be using a number of resources to look at a number of areas: (1) access to the curriculum (for example kids that are not exposed to curriculum); and (2) the model of service delivery. What is working well, particularly in the middle school area is being reviewed by the middle school team. They are looking at this as a whole. The administration will be reporting on this at a later date. Dr. Durkin noted this number (51) needs to increase.

Ms. Roy noted the components of the formula that subgroup has no change in the CPI part, but are a little below in the growth. The state formula for growth does not take into account any kind of subgroup. This is all the children in the state. There is no breakdown of cohorts for example: ELL.

Dr. Durkin stated there are some schools with amazing growth. It can be done. We are reviewing this and analyzing what is being done.

Mr. Parent commented on the top two categories are provided to us by the state. Did we break the remaining information down ourselves?

Ms. Roy explained the state provides all of this information. If you are Level 1: met the target (all students and high needs): Level 2: the district either missed one or two of these.

Dr. Durkin noted Attleboro is Level 2 because we made it in all, but did not meet it in high needs.

Ms. Roy explained the district is rated by its lowest level of schools.

Dr. Durkin noted we have five Level 1 schools and four (4): Level 2: There are five (5) Level 1 schools (Thacher, Willet, Brennan, Wamsutta, and AHS). There are four (4) Level 2 schools: Hyman Fine, Hill-Roberts, Studley, and Coelho.

Mr. Parent stated that it appears that special education is our highest area of concern. Mr. Parent thanked the ELL Coordinator for their work.

Dr. Durkin noted the teachers also helped the ELL testing; as Attleboro has tripled the number of teachers with this training. This is attributed the district "re-inventing" itself.

Ms. Craw noted for clarification purposes: there are four schools at Level 2 and five (5) at Level 1, but three (3) at Level 1 failed to meet the special education requirement. Only two (2) of Attleboro's schools are meeting the requirements across the board which is Willett and Wamsutta.

Ms. Roy stated the presentation will cover this.

Ms. Craw again stated concerns that if three of the five are not meeting special education requirements, what are we working on and towards and how are we going to improve this.

Dr. Durkin restated the work group that is in place. There are schools with incredible progress. The idea is to replicate that work. This information will be summarized.

Mr. Sawyer went over the accountability and assistance levels again (Slide 18). The state takes the data and breaks it down to the rating system. Each school is rated Level 1-5. Level 1: met the target of 75 or higher in both the aggregate and high needs working toward cutting the gap by 2017. Level 2 is where schools did not meet target in either the aggregate or high needs or both did not meet the target. Level 3 is when the school not only did not meet one or both of the targets, but its performance is in the lowest 20%. Levels 4 and 5: requires board action.

Ms. Roy noted the first thing the state does is remove the bottom 20; there is a chance that one could meet both of those targets (all students and high needs) and still be in Level 3 if you fall in the bottom 20 which is a little hard to understand.

Dr. Durkin noted that is why a district always wants to be accelerating progress and never be in the bottom 20. There is a participation factor as well.

Ms. Roy noted some schools may have met both targets but did not meet the participation level. There are a lot of intricate pieces involved.

Dr. Durkin noted Attleboro does not have a participation problem.

Attleboro as a district is automatically classified as Level 2 because it has one or more schools at Level 2. If we had a Level 3 school, which we do not, we would automatically be Level 3. Hyman Fine, Hill-Roberts, Studley, and Coelho are Level 2. Thacher, Willett, Brennan, Wamsutta, and the high school are Level 1. The high needs group for Hyman Fine, Hill-Roberts, Studley, and Coelho did not make their target. The aggregate for Hill-Roberts and Coelho did not make their target. Wamsutta was commended for narrowing the proficiency gap which means it is a Level 1 school in the top 10% that showed growth across the board in all four years. Ms. Roy explained the percentile formula.

Ms. Craw stated in looking at the data for the high school, and this shows Attleboro High School in the bottom third of all Massachusetts High Schools.

Ms. Roy noted as discussed, some schools can meet both of their targets, and still be in the bottom. There would be more high schools like this because the thresholds at the high: more students that are proficient and advanced. Therefore they get a higher CPI, they are making growth, but there are so many more of them, this area is narrowed.

Dr. Durkin noted it also is reflected as to where you are compared. We are inquiring as to how this percentile rank is derived.

Ms. Roy noted according to the indicators they are meeting the achievement, on the higher end, but a little lower on the growth part. They are in the 40-44 range for growth for ELA and Math which is the lower part of the growth. We are meeting the graduation and drop out targets and the achievement targets.

Ms. Craw commented the high school looked good except for the math, special education, and ELL.

Dr. Durkin stated administration does not like the number 31. The state should be releasing more information.

Ms. Roy noted the 2012 data is very strong. It is the cumulative which is part of the PPI which is one of their strongest years. We do see movement.

Ms. Craw again voiced concerns when in looking over the schools in the area or schools with the same grade levels; when students go to apply for colleges and you look at these scores, when coming from Attleboro High School you are 31% proficient.

Ms. Roy noted it is the part of the formula that would place us in the bottom 20; that we really need to focus on. The remainder of the formula for the high school as noted is in the lower end of typical and CPI is meeting targets or above targets in all three categories; and there is some extra credit given as well. It is some of the subgroups that are on the lower end that will continue to work with.

Dr. Durkin reviewed the district level summary. Level 3 is the bottom 20 percent and Level 1 and 2 combined are about 80%. We would like to be Level 1, but are glad we are Level 2. The Superintendent reviewed what worked for Attleboro and will be continued: focus on continuous improvement for all; going deep in reviewing data and practices; matching the right interventions with the right students; mid-course corrections with follow up along the way; targeted approaches and critical standards. It is important to prepare our children for future learning and continue to improve our practices. Attleboro's leadership and voice in key state initiatives continues. The next steps: staying the course, team goal setting, administrator/teacher goal setting; special education workgroup; and the District Improvement Plan for 2013 and Whole School Improvement Plans for 2012-13.

Mr. Sawyer explained the next steps. First and foremost: staying the course. He noted five of our schools are Level 1 and have met the targets and the four schools that are Level 2, just narrowly missed our targets. Attleboro continues to grow, show improvement, we are doing the right kind of work, and will continue to make gains. There are obvious areas of need. We need to put renewed focus and renewed energy to get better results. District level and school level planning will identify these areas of

needs and create plans on how to get better results. These plans are important because they set the foundation by which all the educators in the district will then set goals. Teams of educators will work together to see how they can participate in these improvement plans and goals set by the district and schools. The last piece, we have set up a special education work group and plan to focus on this as a district.

Mr. Murphy thanked Ms. Roy for synthesizing this information. As the state changes the models by which the districts and schools are assessed, is there a danger of creating misperceptions of where a school is succeeding and what challenges that school might be facing for example: the high school data shows steady progress and the formula states otherwise. How do we as a district prevent against misperceptions in either direction. Either that a district is performing better than it is or that the district is under achieving when it is continually improving. What safeguards do we have to prevent that from happening?

Ms. Roy noted the percentile piece is separate. The growth information is very valuable.

Dr. Durkin stated the importance of meeting the targets.

Ms. Roy noted the growth piece provides a great deal of information that is broken down by student. This allows us to flag students who have low growth and ask the question why. The information provided blends this together in a better format. The percentile piece is to take the bottom 20 off and identify the top. In the middle there is more of a broad range.

Mr. Murphy noted where you have this bifurcated system where on one hand one slide shows we are doing well and the next slide show 31%; the risk becomes that there can be errant change made.

Ms. Roy explained the data is unpacked. We go down and review all aspects and focus specifically where it might be breaking down. It does help us quite a bit in this area.

Mr. Murphy noted when you are dealing with rankings and comparing districts, one can make huge changes when only minor ones might be needed. Mr. Murphy stated last year we discussed the implementation of the new math frameworks across the state. Are there any expectations that we might have some "bumps in the road" with regard to assessments in the coming years because of that change?

Ms. Roy stated we know that the test is changing. It is becoming more rigorous. The thresholds are set for advanced and proficient. Part of this is supposedly set by questions that were answered the same, questions that students might have scored more poorly on, and this is supposed to be balanced off. The intention is to balance the transition. We will need to wait and see. It is getting more rigorous. This is noticeable in Grade 3 the items are more in depth.

Mr. Murphy stated the curriculum is being changed correspondently.

This will be blended as we move through the formula by balancing off the results on those common core questions from year-to-year.

Mr. Murphy noted every school district is put in this challenging situation wherein in order to maintain the high standards that the state demands, one runs the risk of misperception that we are not doing what should be done.

Dr. Durkin reminded the committee that with Annual Yearly Progress (AYP); one could get into this category and never get out; which was extremely distressing. Attleboro has some very strong growth data in places with special education and ELL that are off the charts in the above 60 range. Clearly this demonstrates that children came in one way and where they are going. This demonstrates real learning. There are many districts that are upset because that growth data is very low even though the students are high achieving. The growth data is a good barometer that shows when and if our children are truly getting a rich experience which shows growth by the end of a year.

Ms. Roy stated some say when you hit the top it stops, but we have seen some pieces that a student scores a certain amount; and when compared to their cohort we see that score is high.

MCAS letters will go home this week. This information is complicated. Families should not hesitate to ask questions. The growth data is an important piece. Teachers will also explain this during parent/teacher conferences.

Mr. Larson thanked everyone: teachers, coaches, and administration. There are a lot of positive things happening. It is also very clear in looking at how students are scoring and what the goals are for 2017. These challenges will continue to escalate every year going forward. There are things to be happy with, but also there are great strides ahead of us that we need to continue to make.

Mr. Tyler thanked all those involved. We are showing improvement and everyone should be congratulated. Mr. Tyler noted Massachusetts was allowed to opt out of the No Child Left Behind (NCLB). Mr. Tyler thought one would see some significant leeway in MCAS and AYP. The state was granted a waiver, but the same criteria still exists.

Mr. Sawyer noted the change that is reflected in this new system is that the emphasis is placed on the targets to improve rather than strictly on achievement. For example: Attleboro High Schools' data, in the old regime, one would get stuck in a trap that one could never get out of; every year our achievement kept growing, but we kept coming back with an accountability status that was negative. For example: high achieving, but still in corrective action. With the new status, Attleboro High School in continuing to improve is rewarded with a Level 1 status. The new system focuses on improvement towards the final goal rather than strictly adequate yearly progress.

Mr. Sawyer explained when No Child Left Behind (NCLB) was enacted; it left to the states the ability to set proficiency. Everyone had to be proficient, but the states were allowed to define what this would look like. Massachusetts set very rigorous standards. Many states set lower standards. Massachusetts continuously scores the highest nationally, and has one of the best education systems in the country, but because of NCLB came in last year with 80% of the schools in some sort of accountability status. Massachusetts was being punished for having high standards. The waiver has allowed Massachusetts to create a system that still allows high standards, but does not punish for those standards.

Transportation Update: 1st Proposed Quarterly Transportation Report: (Memorandum attached hereto and therefore made a part hereof). The school district is working hard to efficiently use its transportation funds in an attempt to reduce the projected deficit. The process was summarized and explained as to how this will be reduced.

Mr. Rose summarized the current projected transportation deficit for the fiscal year ending June 30, 2013 which is currently \$476,971. It was noted that the state should be reimbursing the city for the homeless transportation expenses which is an estimated \$124,964 incurred during FY12. The Mayor plans to allocate these funds to Attleboro Public Schools to offset the projected FY13 transportation deficit. If these funds are received then, the projected deficit for year ending June 30, 2013 will be reduced to \$352,007. Mr. Rose explained the process that has occurred to this point. Mr. Rose will continue to keep the committee updated.

Mr. Parent stated the importance of the wording of this memorandum and stressed the need to language for the homeless reimbursement needs to be restated and be very clearly defined.

Ms. Craw inquired as to the status on the fee for service applications noting the approximate 180 applicants. Ms. Craw voiced concerns with parents having to wait for the decision.

Mr. Rose stated at this time 27 buses are being utilized. The process is still being reviewed. The contract allows for 29 buses. The district is currently being charged only for the buses being used. The plan is to have the fee for service applications finalized by the first week in October. Mr. Rose noted that a lot of changes occur during the first three weeks of school. The number of students on each bus will be reviewed. The bus routes will be reviewed and finalized. This information will be reviewed and an update will be brought to the committee.

A motion was made to approve the memorandum regarding the transportation status with the revisions discussed: Vote: 7-0

Personnel Report: David Sawyer, Assistant Superintendent: Mr. Sawyer announced one (1) appointment (see Personnel Report dated 09-24-12 attached hereto and therefore made a part hereof): Mr. Sawyer noted the requested approval of the appointment of school nurse:

A motion was made in accordance with Massachusetts General Laws Chapter 71, Section 53: School Nurse: Deborah Maynard:
Discussion: None: Vote: 7-0

Ms. Crow was not present at the previous meeting and wanted to commend the nurse at Thacher.

The Superintendent exited the meeting at 8:40 p.m.

Committee Reports

Finance, Facilities and Procurement Sub-Committee

Notification of bills and warrants:

Warrant: 5CS010: 09-12-12	\$ 94,837.36
Warrant: 5CS011: 09-19-12	\$369,423.73

The next meeting will be held on 10-24-12 @ 7:00 p.m.

Curriculum and Instruction Sub-Committee: Mr. O'Neil noted the next meeting will be held on 10-16-12 @ 6:30 p.m.

Policy Sub-Committee: The following policy was brought forward for approval: Policy CBD: Superintendent's Contract: A motion was made to approve Policy CBD: Superintendent's Contract with the edits provided: Discussion:

Ms. Crow noted the edits done to the current policy were for clarification purposes.

Mr. Murphy stated the three step process. The Full Committee sets the parameters; the Executive Board negotiates these parameters; and the Full Committee approves the negotiated contract.

Ms. Crow stated the policy as previously written was not clear and for that reason the changes were made to better define the process and policy language.

Vote: 7-0: Motion passes. This policy will be tabled for two weeks for public input/comment.

The next meeting will be held on 10-22-12 @ 7:00 p.m.

Mr. Tyler explained the reasons for the forthcoming presentation and noted that Mr. Murphy and Mr. Parent would present the Power Point.

A ten minute recess was taken at 8:50 p.m. Of note, Ms. Crow exited the meeting. The meeting was reconvened at 9:00 p.m.

Superintendent Search Process: Mr. Murphy and Mr. Parent briefed the committee on the upcoming process that will be started to begin the superintendent search (see presentation attached hereto and therefore made a part hereof).

The Superintendent Search Proposal under MGL Chapter 71 Subsection 59 and Attleboro School Committee Policy CB, the School Committee is charged with the appointment of the Superintendent of Schools. This responsibility is the most important and influential authority exercised by the School Committee. The hiring process must be professional, inclusive, and successful.

The Superintendent transition from 1997 to present was explained. The search for superintendent was explained. The proposed process and goals were explained. The Four Phase process was broken down. The proposed timeline was outlined. It was noted all these dates were tentative and subject to change. It was noted Dr. Durkin is the Superintendent of Schools. Dr. Durkin enjoys the full authority and responsibilities of that position. Updates to the full committee will occur on a monthly basis beginning on October 8th. In conclusion, the underlying goal of this proposed superintendent search process is to put forth a search that will be accurately characterized as professional, inclusive, and successful.

A motion was made to authorize the process and timeline as presented: Discussion:

Mr. Parent stressed the importance of this process. Students, teachers, parents, and administrators will work together as one group to allow Attleboro Public Schools to continue forward.

Mr. Murphy noted by law the nine members will vote on this position and stressed the importance of the public input and assistance.

Mr. O'Neil thanked Mr. Murphy and Mr. Parent for their work on this presentation.

Mr. Larson noted the challenges ahead.

Mrs. Zito encouraged a forward process.

Mr. Tyler stated the committee owed it to the community and themselves to bring the best candidate to Attleboro.

Roll Call Vote:

Mrs. Zito:	Yes
Mr. Larson:	Yes
Mr. Parent:	Yes
Mr. Tyler:	Yes
Mr. Murphy:	Yes
Mr. O'Neil:	Yes

Vote: 6-0. Motion passes.

Mr. Tyler noted their would be an informational meeting held tomorrow at 7:00 p.m. MASC offers many free services to the district and this will be a time to go over the superintendent search process and ask any necessary questions.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:28 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Barbara Crow, Secretary

Attachments:

1. Agenda dated 09-24-12
2. School Sponsored Events: 09-24-12
3. Draft School Committee Minutes – 09-10-12
4. ASEPAC Power Point: 09-24-12
5. Assessment Results & Accountability Determinations: Power Point: 09-24-12
6. Memorandum: 09-17-12: Transportation
7. School Committee Personnel Report 09-24-12
8. Warrant: 5CS009
9. Warrant: 5CS010
10. Warrant: 5CS011
11. Power Point: Superintendent Search Guidelines – 09-24-12