

WILLIAM M. DAVIES, JR. CAREER AND TECHNICAL HIGH SCHOOL  
50 Jenckes Hill Road, Lincoln, RI 02865

**Board of Trustees**

**Minutes of the Regular Meeting**

Wednesday, November 7, 2007

*Minutes were accepted at the December 12, 2007 meeting.*

**I. Routine**

A. **Call Meeting to Order**

At 5:19 pm, Dr. Segovis, called the meeting to order.

B. **Roll Call of the Board**

Davies' Executive Assistant called the roll of the Board.

**Members Present:** Richard Beaupre; Raymond Chartier; V. Michael Ferdinandi; Larry Gemma; Carolyn Kyle, *Vice-Chairperson*; John Quinn; Dr. James Segovis, *Chairperson*

**Members Absent:** James Bone; John Gregory; Robert Halkyard; John Nardolillo; Robin Smith

**Others Present:** Victoria A. Gailliard-Garrick, Cheryl Carroll, Bernie Blumenthal, Gerry Manning, Susan Paquin, Fred Slemon, Joanne Andrews, Peter Fangiullo, Thomas Langlois, Cary Wagner

C. **Approval of Minutes** – June 6 and 12, 2007 Regular Session Minutes  
*Mr. Gemma made a motion to accept the minutes of the June 6 and 17, 2007 meetings, Mr. Beaupre seconded the motion, and all were in favor. Because the minutes of the October 3<sup>rd</sup> meeting were not available, the approval of them was deferred until the next meeting.*

D. **Recess to Executive Session Pursuant to R.I.G.L. 42.46-5 (A) (1) and (2) to Discuss Pending Litigation and Personnel Issues**

*At 5:21 pm, Mr. Gemma made a motion to enter into Executive Session pursuant to R.I.G.L. 42.46-5 (A) (1) and (2) to discuss pending litigation and personnel issues. Mr. Beaupre seconded the motion and all were in favor.*

E. **Return to Regular Session**

*At 6:36 pm, Mr. Beaupre made a motion to return to Regular Session and all were in favor.*

*Dr. Segovis asked for a motion to keep the minutes of the Executive Session sealed, Mr. Gemma seconded the motion and all were in favor.*

F. **Opportunity for Audience to Comment**

No comments were made.

## II. *Business Agenda*

- A. **Finance Report** –*Cheryl Carroll, Business Office Coordinator*  
Report was given during the Executive Session.
- B. **Human Resources Report** - *Joanne Andrews, Human Resources Coordinator*  
Report was given during Executive Session.
- C. **Nominating Committee Report** – *Dr. Segovis, Chairman*  
Report was given during Executive Session.
- D. **Board of Trustees 2007-2008 Meeting Calendar** – *Dr. Segovis, Chairman*  
The Board is trying to switch to a morning schedule to ensure quorums present and more participation. The Director will ensure that union representation and staff when needed, are able to attend.
- E. **Approval Strategic Plan 2007-2010/School Improvement Plan 06-08** – *Victoria A. Gailliard-Garrick, Director*  
She gave the Board an executive summary in June and asked the trustees to review it so that they can vote on its approval in September. She then asked the Board for a motion to accept the plan.

*Mr. Ferdinandi made a motion to accept the 2007-2010 Strategic Plan, Dr. Segovis seconded the motion, all were in favor.*

- F. **Formation of Board Sub-committees** – *Dr. Segovis, Chairman*  
Given some of the challenges given to the school, he will be sending around a letter with a list of committees asking the trustees which one(s) they would be interested in serving on. One needs to volunteer to sit on the School Improvement Team.

To be finalized at the next meeting.

## III. *Informational Time/Program Updates*

- A. **Director's Report**
  - 1) **Teachers' Association**-Thomas Langlois, Secretary and member of the Executive Board; Peter Fangiuillo, Treasurer and member of Executive Board; Cary Wagner, member of the Executive Board.  
Mr. Fangiuillo didn't have a report, but on behalf of Frank Barcellos, President, he wanted to follow up on a letter sent to Dr. Segovis regarding the upcoming contract negotiations. The administration does not need to wait for the association to vote on a negotiating team to enter into discussions regarding a rollover of the current contract. The nominations are in December, elections in February.  
  
Dr. Segovis would be glad to meet with Mr. Egan and the two officers along with Vin Ragosta, school's attorney and our administration to begin exploring possibilities.
  - 2) **Teacher Assistants' Association**-Lynn Tait-Romano, President  
No report

### 3) Updates on Student Placement and Certification Reports

Senior Placement - *Bernie Blumenthal, Partnerships in Education  
Coordinator*

(See Supplement Material: Davies Graduates: 2007 Placement Data (as of 10/01/07))

All seniors of the Class of 2007 were surveyed by the School-to-Career Coordinators and him back in May, put together a report, and presented it to the Board at the June meeting. They always like to call the graduates in August to do a follow-up, to see if their plans changed or not. There were some slight changes, but similar to what we saw in the May report, 62% of our students are actually going on to further education. This number is higher than what we have seen in the past. We see this trend of more and more students shifting away from related employment in their field because you can see an opposite effect of a drop in related employment to one of our lowest numbers since tracking this data, down from almost 8%. There is this shift of students saying they need to further their education whether it is in their technical field or not as opposed to going directly into the workforce. They are seeing the market trend that further education is needed whether it is a 2-4-year college or more technical training in their fields. With some career paths, it is critical to continue their education such as Electronics and CIS for example. Some are going out to the workforce and continuing their education part-time.

Mrs. Kyle asked how this report is compared to other high schools. Each school provides their school profile to the admission offices so they can track the number of students that go on to post-secondary education. He can track that, but regarding actual career choices, college choices, or going out into the workforce, that would take some significant time and some disclosure.

Dr. Segovis was concerned about the 25% who are not working or are working but not in their related field. Mr. Blumenthal saw two things that were happening back in June. One was, some students lacked the desire to go into college or into the workforce, but kept their part-time jobs. Second was, there was a small core of students that he labels, "didn't have a pulse." They didn't want to do anything. They said, "I am not sure what I want to do; I'm not sure if I even want to do it." They were sitting like lumps while he tried to bring out something from them, and he just couldn't. Some just don't realize that upon graduation they need to move into action and they don't. Mr. Gemma is concerned about this large number and he would like to see a shift to college. What can we do to get them engaged in something they are passionate about? We need to get more parents involved in their children's education.

Our students choose a technical program that they get locked into, but later realize there is something else they want to do. This is why we see a percentage of graduates working but not in their field. Even at the post secondary level, they keep changing their majors. Mr. Gemma doesn't see

anything wrong with that, but what they learn here at the secondary level is very valuable from a trade point of view.

Mr. Ferdinandi mentioned this data does force us to look at what we need to do to move this school forward in the next ten years.

We have to identify the majors of those 56% and see if they are related their technical training. We have a number of our graduates in Electrical who are attending CCRI's evening school and ABC's evening school, so that is related to their technical training.

Dr. Segovis would like to see a Strategic Planning report on what the role of career and technical education is going in the future. It is being transformed. It is not what we have seen twenty years ago, so what is it going to look like and how do we play in that arena. Right now our model is constructed for the past and not the future. People are going to start asking tougher questions of us. We don't need to panic, but maybe we need to start reading the Millennium Generation book and look at it more carefully.

Certifications – *Victoria A. Gailliard-Garrick - Director*

There was no change in the number of certifications in the technical areas since the last report in June. We have identified a couple of areas that we need to investigate the number of students passing their certification and a couple of areas that are not providing any certifications. Mr. Manning and she have met with all but one technical program. They talked about some of the concerns they have about their certification programs. They have come up with some instructional strategies that will improve these numbers.

The Director went on to say that some of our graduates may not be going into their related technical area, but they employable. They may be in a post-secondary situation in their area or not, but they do still have that certification and have the skills which is added value compared to students coming out of a traditional high school that has zero. Looking at post-secondary education nationally as well as at the state level, those students that come out of technical schools with certifications, they are the students that completed the four-year post programs because they have a sense of added value to performance, etc. There is a correlation here with the 56% going onto post-secondary education with the certification percentage and the programs they are majoring in. Looking at this comparison will determine if we are doing the right thing here.

Three or four years after graduation, have we ever asked the graduates what do they think would have made their experience here at Davies better, that would have better prepared them for the real world? Maybe do a comprehensive survey with some of the graduates to give us some ideas because there is no better person to ask. We get some of those results from the SALT Survey that the students do. The 2007 results are in but the data hasn't been looked at yet.

4) **Senior Project/Mentoring Program** – *Victoria A. Gailliard-Garrick, Director*

Our new Board member wants to talk about mentors and ask the Board members to coordinate some effort to recruit some mentors for our students. Mr. Chartier spoke on how quite a few parents are upset about this procedure. They felt they were blind-sided (what the word was), but he sat through three years of getting this information with five other parents at the Parent Council meetings. He feels a lot of it is the fear of the unknown and it is brand new. He thinks it will work out better next year, but this year we need to get the mentors to help these students along with their senior projects.

Mr. Simms was going to head this up. We had set a meeting back in April or May to help set up a career day with the business and industry group including the American Builders and Contractors. Our plan was to have students come in and have people that are in the industries that are associated with their tech area, talk with them, have a training session with the mentors, but unfortunately Mr. Simms passed away. A number of the senior technical teachers are helping these students get mentors but there are going to be some who will need help and provide mentors for. Mrs. Gailliard-Garrick would like the Board's help with some of their ties and networking. At least 87% of the schools in the state are doing senior projects and will all need mentors so everyone is trying to act upon the same people.

5) **Commissioner's Review** – *Victoria A. Gailliard-Garrick, Director*  
(*See Supplemental Material, "May 2007 Commissioner's Review Report; Executive Summary"*)

We have been going through a Commissioner's Review process through RIDE on the new High School Diploma System, a system that ensures students are proficient in English Language Arts, Mathematics, Science, Social Studies, Arts and Technology. We had a submission in June 2006 that we did very well with in the five components. We scored a "One" in the four out of the five and a "Two" on the Policy and Infrastructure and the Use of Data. We submitted it again in May of 2007 and the tables were turned. We didn't do as well as we thought we did; however, there were some problems in communication between RIDE and the principals. There were some concerns with what they were actually looking for when they looked at the second submission. In doing so, they shifted what they were looking for. The 39 districts and the number of high schools within those districts, about five were looked at as high schools with best practices and what the diploma system is to look like. The rest of us were either in the middle or in low compliance. We were in the middle and based on that submission we had feedback and recommendations we had to comply for RIDE. The handout is primarily focused on what they were looking for us to respond to, which we have completed. We submitted it on the day of this meeting.

## **Component I: PBGRs**

Judy Valentine and a number of teachers in the building worked to meet the recommendations. Component I's recommendations deal with curriculum development, ensuring that our curriculums are aligned with the ELA and Mathematics GSEs. They looked at Gap Analysis, where we are missing the GSEs, are the kids are not getting what they need to know and what they should be able to do in that content area? They also wanted to know what kinds of access opportunities do these students have to be able to be instructed in these areas, so there are multiple pathways that they look at. A perfect example is if a student is coming in as ELL and that student sits in an ELL class or a ramp-up class, then do they have the opportunity to move out of that particular class? Do we have data and benchmarks to move those kids through the path that they can get all the GSEs in each content area?

There are a lot of little pieces to this component, but she said in this component we have met and provided evidence for all of the recommendations except for "Process for revising assessment for bias."

## **Component II: Support to Students**

What are we doing for our students who are not reading at grade level? We needed to demonstrate with evidence that we are working with these students who are reading three grade levels below, two-one grade levels below, and the school-wide literacy. We have complied with two of these with the ramp-up programs and remedial courses whether it is literacy or numeracy. Right now we do not have a plan for a school-wide literacy program meaning we are doing literacy types of instruction and practices and looking at strategies to address literacy across the content areas. We complied with all of the recommendations in this component except we have an Advisory Curriculum Guide but it hasn't been implemented yet because of contract language which limits what they can or cannot do. Some teachers have been looking for this and will voluntarily work with it. The state wants us to implement a full-fledge advisory that all teachers are involved with as part of the personalization program.

## **Component III: Support to Staff**

We are doing all of the recommendations but the data needs to be updated and provide evidence that our professional development activities are aligned to the High School Diploma System, curriculum, instructions, etc. The data process used to identify professional development activities is we look at NEASC, SALT Survey, teacher input to provide some direction. We complied with all of these recommendations.

## **Component IV: Communication**

They wanted to see how we communicate this information internally and externally to our stakeholders. This was provided for them as well.

## **Component V: Policy Infrastructure and Use of Data**

This means looking at the data, interpreting it, and using it to make decisions in the school and for the school improvement process. The

Policy and Appeals Process has to do with the High School Diploma System. We look at what we call standard settings. If we have a standard in what we look for in a research paper; we have a rubric; it has four categories that we look at and we set the standard at proficient categories. There is proficiency level bar and we set where we want the kids to be. Based on that, if we have students who do not meet that bar, what is the appeal process and the policy that relates to it.

All was submitted on the day of this meeting thanks to long hard work. The teachers had to develop all of the curriculums, common tasks, benchmarks, standard setting, and practices. It is a lot of work; it is very overwhelming. The principals and teachers are having a tough time doing this and trying to do their own jobs at the same time. What is happening to the teaching and learning in the classroom when they are spending most of their time trying to gather evidence, make changes, and develop a system?

With all said and done, RIDE will review our binders starting next week. We will get feedback from them in December which will either be that we will have to provide more evidence and defend what we already submitted or they will send a letter out by January 15 saying that we have met the requirements for this review process and we have been granted a “Regents’ Diploma.” This is a diploma that says the students have met our high school diploma system for standard setting and benchmarks that we determined as being proficient.

This is ongoing. Every two years we have to go through another review to make sure everything is being updated ensuring it all stays alive. What is happening is we had the Commissioner’s Review three times in one year, we had the NEASC review during the same year, and the SALT review is coming up pretty soon. They need to get all three together and do one review because they are all asking the same questions.

- 6) **NECAP Testing** – *Victoria A. Gailliard-Garrick, Director*  
The NECAP (New England Common Assessment Program) Testing, which is the new State assessment, took place in October. It is a joint assessment with RI, Vermont and New Hampshire which is based on the GSEs (Grade Span Expectations) in reading, writing and mathematics. The students also took the PSATs in October; and now they have the Science GSEs which they will be tested on in May and down the pike there will be Social Studies. The students are being tested out.
- 7) **NEASC Report** – *Victoria A. Gailliard- Garrick, Director*  
(See Supplemental Material, “Standards of Membership Checklist” and “Self Study Manual.”)  
This is the other review the school went through last year in October. Dr. Segovis asked if there is a work plan on the recommendations that are labeled “Needs Improvement”. Ms. Gailliard has already started work on that and disseminated it to the Dept. Chairs for their feedback. Each has the snapshot of the Educational Program throughout the school and the one for their specific content area.

When the NEASC team comes in to do an assessment, it is based on what the teachers have written in their program self-study and they interview them as well. So some of the things that they say needs improvement, the director can disagree especially those, for instance, where a couple of technical teachers decided they would like to see the Exploratory Program be two periods long instead of one period. She recalls when she first started working here, that this was a major discussion, a vote was taken and the majority of the technical teachers wanted the one period. She will reject this recommendation and she will have evidence why she is rejecting it.

She has the opportunity to go through this document and report to NEASC the status of each recommendation: completed, in progress, not started, rejected. Another recommendation was we need a bilingual program; she will reject this one because we have a total of 70 or 80 students in our ESL program and as part of the requirement for admission, they have to speak English based on the Access Test, so why do we need a bilingual educator here. Some of it is accurate, some of it is inaccurate and some of it is a wish list and she has to go through and decipher it.

The highest number of recommendations was in the Facilities area. The building is old especially the older part. It needs cosmetic work, some new wiring and the newer part of the school is beginning to need work as well.

Mr. Beaupre asked if we had a music program and we do not. Some may exist in other school districts, but when budget cuts need to be made, music is usually the first to go. At Davies, our schedule is pretty much filled because we are providing two content areas of instruction, academic and technical, so we are locked in what we do during the school day. Ms. Gailliard-Garrick and Mr. Slemon write a grant every year for Davies Arts in Education Program. We offer after-school programs that are tied into the Arts like RISD After School Arts Program.

Relative to the NEASC recommendations, there are three primary areas we need to focus on. The health and safety of the building, they felt we were too wide open so we are installing a buzzing system and all the exteriors doors have detect alarms on them. The integration of academic and technical instruction is being worked on. Lastly, they wanted us to do a school-wide policy and procedure manual on the school structure meaning human services, finance, instructional operations, etc. We are working on this as well.

Overall, the director felt this report was good. Dr. Segovis would like a status report at the December meeting. We need to keep track of what is being accomplished monthly. Dr. Segovis congratulated her on those areas that were rated, "Exceeds Expectations." She pretty much knew the areas that needed improvement so she wasn't surprised.

8) **Future Student Night – November 27, 2007**

This is a big night we have here when our prospective students and their families come in to see our programs. We open up a couple of our science labs, Chemistry and Biotechnology. We usually have on an average of 700 or 800 people walk through the doors for 250 slots.

9) **Other**

Regarding the Board meeting calendar, we still need to hear from a couple of people when the best time is for them to meet for a morning meeting. However, for the next meeting in December, we usually have a tradition where we meet socially immediately following the Board meeting. It was decided to meet on December 12<sup>th</sup>. In January we will begin meeting in the mornings.

**Graduation by Proficiency Appeals Process – Judy Valentine,**  
*Supervisor of Academic Instruction*  
(See Supplemental Material: “Graduation by Proficiency Appeals Process Draft”)

We have an appeals process for parents of our students who receive a non-graduating decision. She put this together with the help of Sue Brassard, our Senior Project Facilitator. She would like some feedback, comments, or edits. The Board will provide this at the next meeting. This process is for those students who probably passed their Carnegie units but might have failed their senior project, research paper, or graduation portfolio. The parent has a right to petition to appeal. This is a policy that needs to be adopted by the Board for our Commissioner’s Reviews. Dr. Segovis asked at what level does it come to the Board because we should be the last step. An explanation is on Page Three in the document. On the first few pages is a summary of our graduation diploma system. An explanation of the appeals process begins on Page Three.

Dr. Segovis said they will need to know what kinds of cases could come to them. In some districts, once it is a “No” then it is a “No”, but with anything in education, there is always another process so it will be the Committee first, the Director second, and then it will come to the Board. They can even go further to the Commissioner’s Office. Dr. Segovis just wants clear reasons why it comes to the Board.

At the next meeting, the Board will vote on its acceptance.

**IV. Adjournment:**

*At 7:33 p.m., Dr. Segovis asked for a motion to adjourn, all were in favor.*

**V. Next Meeting:**

December 12, 2007