

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, January 3, 2007

*Minutes were accepted at the March 7, 2007 meeting.*

**I. Routine**

**A. Call Meeting to Order**

At 5:15 pm, Dr. Segovis, Chairperson-elect, called the meeting to order. Mr. Simms enjoyed the holiday gathering and thanked those who made it happen. He hoped everyone had a nice holiday. He advised everyone to return Sue Paquin's calls asking for attendance to the meetings. Dr. Segovis will be making calls this coming month for a variety of reasons and this will be one of them. He needs to get a sense of where everyone is because we need an active board.

It probably isn't good to meet the first week into the new year. We should delay the meeting to later in the month or not have one at all in the month of January.

**B. Roll Call of the Board**

Davies' Executive Assistant called the roll of the Board.

Members Present: Larry Gemma; Carolyn Kyle; Dr. James Segovis, *Chairperson-elect*;  
Harvey Simms; Robin Smith

Members Absent: Richard Beaupre; James Bone; V. Michael Ferdinandi; John Gregory;  
Robert Halkyard; Lornette Uthman

Others Present: Victoria A. Gailliard, Brian Butler, Cheryl Carroll, Judy Valentine, Bernie Blumenthal, Susan Paquin, Andrea Kelly

**C. Approval of Minutes – December 6, 2006 Regular Session Minutes**

A quorum was not present; therefore, the approval of the December 6, 2006 regular session minutes was deferred until the February meeting.

**D. Opportunity for Audience to Comment**

None were made.

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

Recess into Executive Session was postponed until the end of the agenda.

**F. Return to Regular Session**

Did not recess out of Regular Session at this point on the agenda.

**II. Business Agenda**

**A. Finance Report –Cheryl Carroll, Business Office Coordinator**

This report was deferred to the Executive Session.

B. **Human Resources Report**- *Victoria A. Gailliard-Garrick, Director*

We have hired a replacement for the Director of Special Populations. Mr. Bone participated in the final interview process. Fred Slemmon will begin on January 9, 2007. He is from the Pawtucket School Department as the Assistant Director of Special Populations. He was there for 28 years. He dealt with many of the issues we have here but we are a little more complicated because we have the Reading Department with ELL as an added responsibility, why the department is called Special Populations and not Special Education.

Mrs. Gailliard-Garrick added that Mr. Stephen Thornton, her predecessor, had a lot of foresight. What is happening is a lot of school districts as well as the Dept. of Ed. changed the Special Education Director title to Special Populations Director because they are including under that auspices the English language learner as well as the special education population. Mr. Slemmon has experience in both of these fields.

We are concurrently working on hiring a Math teacher because of Nick Murgo's retirement.

Dr. Segovis would like for the Board a list of names of the teachers and their departments.

C. **Review of By-Laws**- *Dr. Segovis, Chairperson*

Given the fact that everyone is not in attendance, copies of the by-laws were included in the agenda packets. Historically, the board went through these by-laws during several meetings. After reviewing it, there is nothing about the selection of the chairperson or the vice chair directly. There was something written up informally from Mr. Mitchrone.

The procedure for selecting a vice chair is the chair and the director/principal are to preside as the nominating committee. Members interested in being a vice chair are to submit their names to the nominating committee and other members can also submit names of potential candidates. The nominating committee will interview and screen the candidates to determine their interest. Once the candidates have been finalized, voting by the Board of Trustees shall be conducted using paper ballots.

This is standard practice so Dr. Segovis will make the phone calls and collect the names. He will begin making calls at the end of the week and go through to the end of the month touching base with the Board members to find out what their interests are.

**III. Informational Time/Program Updates**

A. **Director's Report**

1) Teachers' Association-Frank Barcellos, President  
Mr. Barcellos sends his regrets.

2) Teacher Assistants' Association-Lynn Tait-Romano, President  
Ms. Tait was not present.

3) Technical Enrollments by Program and Community—Victoria A.

*Gailliard-Garrick*

*See Supplemental Material: Enrollment by Technical Area, School Year 2006-2007, January 1, 2007 and August 1, 2006)*

Mrs. Garrick distributed these two documents to compare the numbers of students enrolled in the technical programs at the beginning of this school year with the number of students enrolled in them currently keeping in mind that we are funded for 825 students. We renovated the Aquaculture Building to accommodate 60 additional students and added five new teachers to accommodate that 825 enrollment.

She is looking at numbers currently that are not meeting what we are required and funded for. There is a lot of drop in our 10<sup>th</sup>, 11<sup>th</sup>, and 12<sup>th</sup> grades and the numbers in each of the technical areas are extremely low. Some of the technical areas have three teachers and some of them have two. She is presenting this to the Board for a number of reasons. One reason is she needs some assistance on how to increase or retain the numbers that we have at the beginning of September. We have some issues with retaining our students that impact our technical areas with the teacher/student ratios. She cannot justify those shops that have three teachers with such low numbers.

Mr. Simms feels we need to outreach to these students by telling them there is nothing wrong with going into career education. You can still go to college and there is a lot of money to be made working in a career and technical field. They can have the best of both worlds. We are not doing a good job telling our young people that.

Mr. Gemma asked if it is common to have a freshman class of 256 and by 12<sup>th</sup> grade, enrollment is down to 149. He also asked if anyone has ever polled those students leaving. Mrs. Garrick answered affirmatively and she started to do the polling this year for first quarter. There has never been a problem with the numbers in 9<sup>th</sup> grade. There is a waiting list usually with 100-150 students on it. Part of the reason why we lose them is we have a policy where if you fail shop, you repeat the grade. Kids may pass all of their academic courses and when they fail their shop courses, they will return to their sending districts because they don't want to repeat the grade. This policy may have some issues; however, we are a career and technical school and that is the way it is. If they don't pass, they can't move on to the next year.

Mr. Gemma suggested that when the students are taking their entrance exams, they should be tested on some technical skills as well. Mrs. Garrick said that was a very good observation because when we do our admission testing, we do the acceptances based on the academic grade equivalents in Reading and Mathematics. Once they get here, we do what we call Career Choices, and they do an inventory as such. This might be part of the problem why they are not doing well in the technical areas. This is an excellent point and we haven't looked at that.

We have academic ramp-up programs and the students are doing well in them, and now, she is looking the 11<sup>th</sup> grade state assessment scores by shop areas to give her an idea if they can be successful in their shop, but that is only one grade.

Mrs. Kyle asked if there is some sort of mentoring process for these kids. Is there a safety net for them when they get stuck so far into the program? We have an exploratory program when each student gets a flavor of each of the technical programs. Those teachers do a rating for probable success. There will be indicators even in the short time they go through the exploratory program. When the process is done, the students pick first, second, and third choice, and the most popular shops get filled very quickly and the students end up getting bumped to their second choice, and so on. We are losing kids between 10<sup>th</sup> and 11<sup>th</sup> grade and a lot of it has to do with Davies is a high performing school and we have raised the bar. When you raise the bar there has to be some pulling at the other end of it and we are feeling some of the ramifications of raising that bar.

Mr. Gemma knows the State has an aptitude test for the trades. Is this something that could be given at the same time the students are tested for academics? The 9<sup>th</sup> graders take the Apticon (?) test. Dr. Segovis asked how well do the Special Education students fair in all of this. That is another issue. If a student doesn't get in under the standardize testing, there is a second level for acceptance for Special Ed. students and English Language Learners so the bar drops for those kids academically, and those are the kids that we concentrate on doing the ramp-up programs. These are the kids that when you set benchmarks for program certifications, you automatically look at those kids and where they are proficiency wise, and then you know that there are going to be a number of kids that are not going to make it, but the bulk of the kids that are leaving here are not those kids. Those are the kids that have the academic ability and should have the technical ability, but Mr. Gemma is right, we don't really know that because she has never been satisfied with how they use the information from the Apticon testing as well as the Choices program. That gives them the interest and what their learning styles are and she doesn't think they are used. This may be half the battle.

Mr. Gemma asked if the students can switch careers midway. They can switch up until the end of the first semester in Grade 10. Electronics is very popular and if that is the student's first choice and there is only 25 slots, the student has to be one of the first 25 students who did well on the Exploratory assessment. There has been a decrease in Electronics in the last couple of years, so we would go through the waiting list and bring those kids in but sometimes that doesn't happen so they end up in their second or third choice shop, something they are not truly interested in.

Mr. Butler added that another problem is the ninth graders who didn't get admitted to Davies and are now attending the school in their own district, getting used to that school and becomes reluctant to come to Davies for 10<sup>th</sup> grade.

Some years ago, Guidance used to go into the schools and recruit 10<sup>th</sup> graders. Maybe we should do that again and find those kids who were interested in Davies the previous year but didn't pass the entrance exam. Mr. Gemma suggested having a test for 10<sup>th</sup> graders as well.

Dr. Segovis suggested interviewing these exiting students to find out why they are leaving. Guidance is currently doing that. Most of them are going back to their sending districts as opposed to moving out of district and they need to find out why. She told Guidance for the remaining of this school year, she wants a report at the end of each quarter why they are leaving.

Dr. Segovis feels we need to have a committee dedicated to this issue, but we still need to gather more data and treat it as a total quality management issue. It will be an opportunity to bring in some board members to do some brainstorming. There are too many teachers in areas that are under-enrolled, yet the students can't get their first choice in those areas. It doesn't make sense and we need to start figuring out why. He will find volunteers for that committee for retention and turnover and start problem solving our way through it.

We are trying to put together a more comprehensive advisory program that can monitor some of this. The Advisory Program has domains: emotional, social, career and academic and the students have one adult with 12 other students who will maintain a relationship with them over the course of the four years, but also look at the student's Individual Learning Plan and part of that is the career piece. This is something we are trying to pull together in order to assist some of these kids. By polling these students upon exiting, we may find a pattern within some of the shop areas.

- 4) Technical Program Approval Process— *Victoria A. Gailliard-Garrick*  
Mrs. Gailliard-Garrick gave a little background information on what this process is and why we are leaning towards it. She invited Mrs. Andrea Kelly, Business Technology Teacher, to speak to the Board tonight about this process. She was asked because her program is a fine, if not the finest, program in the school. Mrs. Garrick selected her to go through a beta testing of this process with Charlie Majowski (sp?) who is a hired consultant from RIDE, and Vanessa Cooley, who is the Perkins Coordinator from RIDE as well.

After a review of all of the career and tech programs by the members of the House of Representatives a couple of years ago lead by Paul Crowley, they found out that a lot of the programs they reviewed were not up to par; the quality was not there not only in the comprehensive schools that offer technical education, but also some of the technical centers. So they went back, had a lot of discussion. In the newspapers, you have read all of the issues surrounding career and tech education and one of the main issues is tied to funding.

RIDE has put together a project advisory committee that Charles Majowski is heading up.. They developed a program approval process designed to assess the

quality of all career and technical programs throughout the state for two reasons: 1) obviously it's funding and looking at learning outcomes, looking at indicators to determine whether it is a quality program, and 2) there are programs that are decent but need some improvement and this process will assist them.

There are four components or categories of the process review: 1) program design and evaluation, 2) curriculum, instruction and design, 3) instructional organization and support, and 4) program operation. In the beginning of December Mrs. Kelly, Mr. Esser, Carpentry Teacher, and the Carpentry instructor at Woonsocket Career and Tech, went through this process. There is a template they had to follow in each of those components. They had to respond in narrative form and give evidence to prove the competence of their program, instruction, teaching, and etc. The purpose of going through this pilot is RIDE wanted some feedback on the process like the length of time it takes to go through this process, was the criteria they established measuring anything, etc.

Mrs. Kelly did an excellent job presenting her program and evidence. She is going to give the Board some information on what she went through, what she feels are the negatives and the positives of this process, and if it is a worthwhile process to determine the quality of a program.

At this point, Mrs. Kelly introduced herself to the Board and she mentioned first that the process of going through this would not have been attainable without the concerted effort and teamwork with working with Mrs. Garrick and Ms. Paquin to get this accomplished.

“It was a massive undertaking from my point of view only because I didn't have a lot of time to pull this all together. There was a deadline they wanted us to meet in early December. If you remember the items that we had to go through in regards to NEASC evaluation, this was very much like a NEASC evaluation but on a much smaller scale, but the difference between a NEASC evaluation and this was the fact that we had to provide evidence and documentation proving we are doing exactly what we were saying we are doing in the classroom, with our advisory boards, with our certifications. We had to pull all of this documentation together. Fortunately for me it was a little easier because people who know me, know I keep everything so if anyone needs anything over the course of the last 13 years, they know where to come. I have everything labeled so it was a little bit easier for me. For those technical areas that are going to have to eventually do this, it will be a very time consuming task. It is going to be a lot of work, but like I told Mrs. Garrick, I felt very inspired by it. I love teaching and it just reinforces all the things I have been doing for all of these years. I really enjoy bringing it together and showing what the students are capable of doing. It isn't about me; it is about the students and what they can do. I am only as good as my students are. This is an important concept and people have to remember that.”

Mrs. Garrick then said that she did a wonderful job. She asked Mrs. Kelly if she thinks the process is worthwhile and will truly determine a

quality program vs. one that is not. Mrs. Kelly felt that the design made it look like a manual type document so it was very easy to go through and understand once all the documentation was pulled together. It brought everything together and it will help with writing lesson plans. Rather than write out all of the objectives in the lesson plan, she just makes a copy of the curriculum guide that corresponds to the lesson plan for the week and attaches it to it because it outlines everything there. She feels this is going to be an important document for all of the career and technical areas. She thinks it is going to make people accountable for what they are doing in the classroom which she thinks from a business perspective in a business area, is a key component to any program.

Mr. Simms asked how the three individuals got selected. Two were from Davies, Mrs. Kelly for the Business Technology program, Mr. Esser for the Carpentry Program, and Woonsocket's Carpentry Program. Mr. Simms mentioned, just as a note, Davies Carpentry Program and Woonsocket's produce far better graduates than other carpentry programs. Mrs. Garrick continued saying that it has been determined that millions and millions of dollars are being spent at the high school level. If you look over the last three to four years (this doesn't include Davies) at RI's performance indicators, they are not being met. They are spending good money after bad. Mr. Crowley and other legislators that came in and started to look at and investigate the quality of programs, they were wildly spending not only Perkins money but state funds as well that was allocated for career and technical education. One can walk into a program at "X" high school that has a hotplate and a microwave and they are calling that a culinary arts program and we are providing Perkins money. They are saying that they cannot continue to give out Perkins money or state money if they can't hold programs accountable and we can't meet the demands of the economy in construction, in business technology, etc. We are not doing that at this point. If we can't tie this in programs that are of quality, teachers are accountable, and students are walking out with some kind of skill in hand, then they are not going to fund them anymore. The key to this whole process is the accountability.

Mr. Simms asked if Mr. Crowley was using some kind of benchmark. Mrs. Garrick thinks, she was not privy to any of the information that was shared with him from RIDE in any of the data they collected, but she knows the statistics and the data that she looked at, not good. She is assuming it came out of that information. All Mr. Crowley said when he came to Davies was that some of the programs he just left, were not working and he was not happy. Fortunately for us, he was happy with what was going on in a majority of the programs, and there are some programs that need some work, but this process also allows us to look at where we need to improve. It isn't like they are going to throw everything out the window; there is a timeline. There is a three year period that they are looking at implementing different parts of this process.

RIDE is having four open forums this month. There is going to be one here at Davies on January 22<sup>nd</sup> to talk about this program approval

process. They are going to roll out the design of the beta testing that they did with Mrs. Kelly and the carpentry teachers. They are going to tell everyone what their expectations are and give them more detail in the actual process that is going to be used and implemented. They are also asking each of the schools that currently receive Perkins funding (Davies and the six other high schools that Mrs. Garrick allocate Perkins funding to for programs) to submit a program of study and some other information that she is not quite sure yet what that is, by May, and that is going to be a part of the Perkins for the 07-08 scheduled field testing in the comprehensive high schools as well as the career and technical centers. They haven't decided when this is going to be rolled out completely. They are looking at kind of staggering this whole process, for instance, there are nine tech centers and a couple of comprehensive schools that have some sort of automotive programs, so they might do all of the automotive programs in year one, and maybe all of the culinary programs, then do a couple of other programs the second year and so on until they are done.

This is a major task and it is something that has been needed for quite some time. Too often you find children leaving high school and they are not prepared and this is a step in the right direction to hold everyone accountable for the lives of these children that are so precious and we need to pay attention to.

Dr. Segovis said that Mr. Crowley has had at least ten years invested in education receiving ongoing input from observations, interviews, site visits, and he just got fed up and he wants accountability for those state dollars. He has also sat on the Board of Regents for a number of years.

5) Professional Development Day-January 26, 2007—*Victoria A. Gailliard-Garrick*

There will be two workshops for the staff. One is going to be on parent involvement, parent engagement, and getting the teachers more involved in contacting parents by providing some kind of link to the families when it comes to their child's educational experience. An outside consultant will be coming in to do the workshop.

The second workshop is on how to assess student work identifying patterns in a teacher's instructional program which might tie in perfectly with what we talked about involving the technical areas. They won't only be learning how to assess student work, but they will also be looking at instructional strategies to help teachers improve. Teachers are the best people who can assess each other and help more than an administrator. They are apt to put more credence into it and make some of those changes.

Then Mrs. Garrick always sits down with the teachers and have what she calls a fireside chat with them. She listens to some of their concerns and she shares with them some of her concerns. It gives them an opportunity to have some time with her to discuss where we are going, where the school is going. She does this once a year with them.

On her agenda is the Commissioner's Review, our current 11<sup>th</sup> graders that are going to be required to show proficiency come June 2008. There are some concerns with some of the technical teachers about the senior project and how it should work. They need to understand that this is what it is. We are asking them to be a part of the senior project. The students have to do 15 minimum hours of community service in a career related area. It doesn't have to be anything in the curriculum but it has to be related to their training, but some of them don't like that idea. They think the child should have a choice of anything they want. She said to them you don't have a kid that the state is paying \$17,000 a year to be trained in Electrical and get up in their senior year and say, "I want to be a photographer." You just can't do that and they don't seem to see the connection there. So this is one of the topics. They are supposed to be preparing these students for the world of work in these technical training areas.

One of the issues with some of these tech teachers is about accountability. They work with these students for three years and now these kids have to do a senior project, an oral presentation, write a research paper related to their career area, and do a portfolio to showcase their experience (another way she and Mr. Butler can measure whether or not they are doing their jobs in their technical areas). This is a concern for some of them and this is the first time in a very long time that the technical areas are going to be held accountable. They have been watching this since 1997 in the academic areas and now it is their turn. Even though she has extended the olive branch along with Brian to offer them support, some of them are not teachers. Even though they have all of that knowledge, some of them cannot transfer that information over to their students. This is another way to measure that with the whole issue of accountability.

This is my main agenda item to try to relieve some of the concerns and fears they have in moving forward with this project because we have no choice. 2008 is right around the corner. Dr. Segovis asked if Mrs. Garrick needed any board members there. She answered not at this time, but she may need them at another time if they don't get on board with the senior project. Mr. Simms or Mr. Gemma will need to tell them, "We are business people and this is what we need." She may need the board because this has been an on going battle for the last year. The students are gung ho and all we are asking the teachers to do is to monitor it. The students have to do 15 community hours on their own; they have to go out and find a business person to work with on their own. The technical center that she set up a couple years ago, the teacher is doing a senior seminar and she is helping them go through this whole process, and there is a team of teachers on the School Structures sub-committee that are trying to work through this. There are zero tech teachers on that committee and it is not as though they are being asked to do a lot.

Mr. Gemma and Mr. Simms can outreach to some companies to help out with the community service but also be senior project oriented which will help the students with the research paper requirement. Mrs. Garrick thought that was a wonderful idea. It's a lot of work for the students to hustle these companies. Mr. Blumenthal said it would be to our advantage to do that if we can pretty early this term because this is a state wide initiative and now

you are looking at all of this current year's juniors that must implement this program next year so there will be a wave of students going out. To position Davies students with the companies, we need to lock that in as soon as we can. Mr. Gemma asked for a write-up on the program that they can put out as an e-mail to all the different companies and contractors. Mrs. Garrick, Mr. Butler and Mr. Blumenthal will contact Mr. Gemma and Mr. Simms and go over what we need to do to get this done. We need to clarify the program, here is what we need, this is what it entails, this is what we expect of you, and then we can have a job fair, have some students come with some resumes and match them up with companies, and turn it into a matching process all to generate a learning and committed process. Mr. Gemma felt this was a great opportunity for Davies to get more engaged with the business community. It would get the technical teachers more interested to buy into this process. It is a win-win situation for everyone.

*IV. Back to Routine*

A. **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 6:14 pm, Mr. Simms made a motion to recess into Executive Session pursuant to R.I.G.L. 42.46-5 (A) (1) and (2) to discuss pending litigation and personnel issues. Mrs. Kyle seconded the motion and all were in favor.*

B. **Return to Regular Session**

*At 6:56 pm, Mr. Simms made a motion to return to regular session pursuant to R.I.G.L. 42.46-5 (A) (1) and (2) to discuss pending litigation and personnel issues. Mr. Gemma seconded the motion and all were in favor.*

*IV. Adjournment:*

*At 6:57 p.m., Dr. Segovis asked for a motion to adjourn and all were in favor.*

*V. Next Meeting:*

*Wednesday, March 7, 2007*