

WATERBURY BOARD OF EDUCATION

MINUTES ~ REGULAR MEETING

Monday, October 4, 2010 at 6:30 p.m.

Waterbury Arts Magnet School, 16 South Elm Street, Waterbury, Connecticut

PRESENT: President Hayes, Commissioners D'Angelo, Flaherty-Merritt, Harvey, Morales, O'Leary, Stango, Sweeney, Theriault, and White.

ALSO PRESENT: Superintendent Snead, Assistant Superintendent Sequeira, Chief Operating Officer Paul Guidone, Director of Personnel Ron Frost, School Business Administrator Paul Mazzaccaro, Attorney Maurice Mosley, Education Liaison Mary Ann Marold, and School Inspector Herbert Greengas.

MEETING CALLED TO ORDER

President Hayes called the meeting to order at 6:38 p.m. with a moment of silence and a prayer and Superintendent Snead led everyone in the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag.

ROLL CALL

CLERK: Commissioner D'Angelo.

D'ANGELO: Present.

CLERK: Commissioner Flaherty-Merritt.

FLAHERTY-MERRITT: Present.

CLERK: Commissioner Harvey.

HARVEY: Here

CLERK: Commissioner Morales.

MORALES: Here.

CLERK: Commissioner O'Leary.

O'LEARY: Here.

CLERK: Commissioner Stango.

STANGO: Here.

CLERK: Commissioner Sweeney.

SWEENEY: Here.

CLERK: Commissioner Theriault.

THERIAULT: Here.

CLERK: Commissioner White.

WHITE: Here.

CLERK: President Hayes.

HAYES: Here.

COMMUNICATIONS:

Upon a motion by Commissioner Harvey and duly seconded by Commissioner White, it was voted unanimously to receive and place on file the following communications:

1. Communication dated September 21, 2010 from Civil Service certifying Matthew Calabrese for the position of Supervising Vice Principal.
2. Communication dated September 26, 2010 from Barbara Conlou regarding presentation on Internet.
3. Communication dated September 26, 2010 from Ruth Dempsey regarding presentation on on-line fraud and Face Book.
4. Copy of editorial entitled "Misleading data on achievement gap" from the September 26, 2010 Republican American submitted by Commissioner Theriault.
5. Communication dated September 27, 2010 from Roberta Wall regarding presentation on Internet scams.
6. Copy of editorial entitled "Carrot and stick, or just the stick?" from the September 27, 2010 Republican American submitted by Commissioner Theriault.
7. Copy of article entitled "Labor agreement caucus comes down to respect" from the September 27, 2010 Republican American submitted by Commissioner Theriault.
8. Additional historical information received September 27, 2010 on Corado "Babe" Ciarlo from Thomas Ciarlo.
9. Communication dated September 27, 2010 from Craig Schmidt, Risk Manager to the Safety and Health Committee regarding a request to update a safety committee for the School Inspector's Office.

HAYES: Motion made and seconded. Any discussion? Hearing none - all in favor, opposed, motion passes unanimously.

PUBLIC ADDRESSES THE BOARD:

Upon a motion by Commissioner D'Angelo and duly seconded by Commissioner Stango, it was voted unanimously to suspend the regular order of business to allow the public to address the Board at 6:41 p.m.

HAYES: Motion is made and seconded. All in favor, opposed, motion passed unanimously. All speakers are encouraged to submit prepared written statements to the Commissioners. Comments shall be limited to a maximum of three minutes. There will be no responses this evening to any questions or concerns raised; they will be referred to the Administration for review and response.

Monroe Webster, 25 Crown Street, had the following comments: I am the President of the Greater Waterbury NAACP and also the Chairman of the Liaison Committee appointment through Good Jobs by the Mayor. I want to speak to you tonight just on two topics – one regarding the superintendent position and then to speak briefly about the PLA. A doctorate does not a good superintendent make, a new building does not insure a child is going to learn. I'll use WAMS, this building WAMS as an example, there are students that are here because they want to be here; there are other students that are here because their parents want them to be here and we can definitely tell the difference. Their success is not based on the principal who is doing a good job, but her entire faculty and entire support staff. My community is questioning the appearance of lowering the requirements for the superintendent position and raising the salary. It appears to be a slap in the face even to Dr. Snead. But, again, the degree is not going to raise our child's test scores, having a degree, having that doctorate is not necessarily going to raise our child's test scores. What we're looking for is the person, what all of us should be looking for, is the person that feels that they can make a difference in terms of being about to improve the scores throughout this district. And again, I don't believe, and I don't think any of you believe, that any one person by him or by herself is gonna be able to do that, whether they have a doctorate or whether they don't have a doctorate. What is gonna be required, what is absolutely required, is the support of each and every one of us starting in the Central Office right on down to the custodial staff. And yes, the custodial staff is just as important. But again, I think in terms of pinpointing, we talk about what's gonna make the difference. I believe what is gonna make the difference and what has been difficult has been our parents. And we have seen a difference; we have seen an improvement in terms of parent involvement. We are always striving to get more parents out here to talk with teachers, to talk with their students, and be involved – it is critical.

Let me move on to the PLA. The Project Labor Agreement, we have had I think three projects that are completed, plus City Hall. Our problem, NAACP problem, community problem, is that we, Waterbury residents, are not getting the jobs. Waterbury residents have not been getting the jobs. We have three, maybe four more projects that are ahead of us and we have got to see that Waterbury residents get into those jobs. If the PLA is not doing that then we have to look at some alternative. PLA is good, has some good benefits, but if there's some alternatives to having a PLA that are going to allow our residents to work, then that's what we're working for, thank you.

James Monroe, 250 Wood Street, had the following comments: I'd like to thank everybody for coming out. I'm going to try and be brief. March 1909 (sic), that's when the NAACP first stepped up to the plate, that's when we first met with Dr. Snead, Jeff Cugno, Cathy Awwad, Jeff Marrow who has done an outstanding job, and the men that I represent, some 20 guys that are professional guys that were in a union, that live in the community, and would like to work. WDC, Leo Franks and the Mayor, yet to date, not one of those individuals have been hired. The question is non-union versus union. I am a union man, born in the union, very proud to have been a past person in the union, but I have another problem, I'd like to pass out to you, I'm a veteran, it has no statistics for the veterans, what did we do forget about the guys that went to war and fought for this Country? You have all kind of statistics, nothing for veterans. And the reason why, I'm not like Blumenthal to say I was somewhere and I wasn't. I'm blessed with two DD214's and can't get a job in the City of Waterbury. I'm also on the Committee. You know, we need to really think about the people in Waterbury, get them some jobs. If I go to New

Haven, Bridgeport, or Hartford right now I cannot be hired until their people are hired, you need to stand on the same principal here. Thank you.

Patricia Doherty, 118 Redcoat Road, had the following comments: I'm a paraprofessional for the Waterbury School System. I've been a Waterbury resident since 1971, raised my children here, and I've worked in the Waterbury School System since 1989. I'm not here to speak for the teachers whom are wonderful people. I'm not here to speak for other paraprofessionals throughout the Waterbury School System, and I'm not here to speak for my union, the White Collar. I'm here to speak as an advocate for the special education students I've come in contact with throughout the years and the ones I see on a daily basis and as a grandmother of a special needs child. I work in a magnet school that houses grade six through twelve. Since we have a lottery we accept children in different educational range levels from a kindergarten level and up. Many excel in the arts but not in the academics. Unfortunately we have to pull them from their art's classes, the one class they are good in and love, to try and help them catch up on the work they're not getting done in class. These children in some cases have had a one-on-one para or there were several paras in their previous classes before coming to the magnet school. They no longer have the one-on-one para or as many support staff people in their new environment. We could better service the children if we had even a few more paras on board. Our special education teachers are exceptional but they can't do everything either. We have two floater paras, one in middle school and one in high school. There are four one-on-one paras in the building. If a floater para is absent no one services the children who fell in that para's schedule or if a one-on-one para is absent and takes over and does the para's job that's sick then no one takes care of the floater para's children. With an absence sometimes our lunch break is compromised because there's no coverage. I'm not here to ask for a pay raise, not that I wouldn't love one since my workload has multiplied a hundred times since I was first hired, but I am asking you to please consider using some of the money to hire paras. Ideally for the school I work at, one para per grade would be perfect for the special education student's success. Right now we are doing an injustice to the students who depend on us, all of us, to help them succeed educationally and in life. Since it takes a whole community to raise a child, do your part by offering some of the funds to hire the paras needed to service our children to the fullest. Thank you.

Rayshawn Camp, 18 Woodmere Road, had the following comments: I went to Wallace, Crosby. I got into a little bit of trouble when I was younger. I grew up. I know several people here. I'm speaking for the PLA because all my life I worked K-Mart, Pizza Hut, . . . you cannot work in Waterbury making minimum wage. It's as simple as that. I go to work in the union, they teach me. I've been to school. I've got 280 hours of school. When I go to school they feed me, give me my own room, my own shower, my own bathroom, basically. When I'm at the job I learn a lot. Not only do I learn I get certified. So if the union didn't work out one day I still am certified to get a job in the same field. I don't have to argue with my boss, if I have a problem with my boss I call my union rep and he argues, that's a big burden off my shoulder, that makes me concentrate more. I grew up on Walnut Street, one of the roughest streets in Waterbury; in '94 when it was rough, that's when I graduated. I don't know if you guys have any questions for me. I am an apprentice; I've been working consistently this whole year, maybe a week here and there but I got full medical benefits for my daughter. I was behind in child support like 8,000, now I'm caught up to 3,000 because I've been working. I don't have to look behind my back for a child support officer to pay

outrageous child support because I could make a good wage now. Not only that, I stand on my own two feet, I don't have to depend on nobody else, nobody else. I don't have to call my mother, nobody. My mother worked for the Waterbury Board of Ed, her name was Bernice Camp. She worked there a long time at Maloney. So I have a little education but I made mistakes and the union helped me right those mistakes. And not only that it's like a family. I work at Local 611 and one more, the guy Ray Sullivan works at Bishop Street, he did a lot, he walked me through the program, he held my hand because I needed my hand to be held. He made me be a man and he explained to me not only how to talk to people when you get excited, explain yourself more clearly. I'd just like to thank you, if you had any questions?

Jasmine Bush, 123 Hans Avenue, had the following comments: I have been a Waterbury resident my whole life. I'm a member of the IBEW Local 488. I went to Kaynor Tech and got accepted right after high school. I work at the Enlightenment School right now because of the PLA. This is my first time working in Waterbury and I'm a third year apprentice. I get an amazing education for the cost of nothing; I go to school twice a week, I am proud to be a member.

Jennifer Normand, 26 Whittlesey Avenue, had the following comments: I'm a member of IBEW Local 488; I'm a fourth year apprentice. The past four years I've had the opportunity to work at Kennedy High School, Gilmartin, and I'm now at Duggan School. I was a student at Kaynor Tech and got into the union straight out of high school. If it wasn't for the union I probably would be out of work right now but right now I'm making good money, I'm in a better position than some of my friends. If it wasn't for the PLA's I would probably be out of work for the last year. If PLA's come forth, I would like the opportunity to keep working in my town. Thanks.

Wendy Mendez, 41 Drake Street, had the following comments: I am a third year apprentice for the Local 488 IBEW. I am a single mother of two. I am very proud to be a union member and if it wasn't for the PLA's I wouldn't have insurance benefits to support my children. I went to a non-union school with the intentions of getting an apprenticeship, benefits, and my license and all I got was a piece of paper to hang on the wall and a bill that I get every month for a loan I had to take out for that piece of paper. If it wasn't for PLA's, I'd be nowhere. And right now I have a future for myself and for my children. So I really do feel that we need these PLA's.

Greg Tomshesky, 54 Beacon Hill Blvd., Wolcott, CT, had the following comments: I've been involved with construction in the electrical field for over 30 years. A lot of projects . . . I'm presently employed by a local contractor that works out of Waterbury. He also employs multiple Waterbury citizens. My personal opinion, these . . . of Waterbury, a Company that does work in Waterbury, I think it should be a shame . . . fair honest bid for the people in this town that are non-union that have been working here and are residents here. I think the taxpayer and the citizens of Waterbury, that would be unfair if they didn't have the opportunity to bid. Thank you very much.

Adonis Smith, 37 Hart Circle, had the following comments: If it wasn't for these PLA's I would be out of work. I've had the opportunity to work with five different Waterbury schools; I'm a fourth year apprentice. I've been certified on every . . . equipment except for the crane. I have excellent health insurance. If anything ever happens to me I just go straight to the hospital, I don't have to worry about it. I have

money in the bank, steady work, and am a very strong believer in the PAL's (sic). Like I expressed, if it wasn't for these I would be out of work right now. Thank you for your time.

Irma Lee Roberts, 136 Store Avenue, had the following comments: I'm out the Local 424 and went through the apprentice program and I am a Journeywoman Iron Worker. If it wasn't for the PLA work I wouldn't be able to work, paying benefits and my taxes. Say "yes" to PLA.

Israel Alvarado, Jr., 12 Woodruff Street, had the following comments: I entered the Local 481 Painters Union in 1999. I left in 2005 after running head first into these economy problems; I was laid off for 12 months. I went to a non-union company and was paid like \$16.00 an hour to do the same thing I do in the union now for over \$20.00 an hour and it was very unorganized work, didn't like it. I got promoted to \$18.00 an hour, had to read blueprints, run 10-man crews, and run all over this country, very unorganized work. I appreciate the unions, very organized, more paid, have health benefits, and no cost for medications. And I appreciate the union. Thank you, have a nice day.

David Joo, 61 Edin Avenue, had the following comments: I'm really happy about these PLA's because if it wasn't for the PLA's I wouldn't be working right now. I'm currently a third year apprentice in Sheet Metal Local 40. And I just started my third year apprenticeship and I pretty much worked almost my entire apprenticeship in Waterbury, so it's helping me get my training, my hours in to work. It's got excellent benefits, my father is currently employed with Sheet Metal Local 40 and he's also been working down at Enlightenment School. So thank God for the PLA's. Being a union worker we're really skilled craftsman, the schooling is excellent, it's challenging training but it really helps me in the long run. Our benefits are excellent, pension as well. Go PLA's. Thank you.

Milclos Joo, 61 Edin Avenue, had the following comments: My son spoke before and I'm gonna support the PLA. I work in a lot of Waterbury schools – Wilby, Kennedy High School. A couple of years ago I got laid off . . . in Waterbury. You know just, I said, it's union, it's the best, just my son said, it's all craftsmanship. Nobody complain after everything is done. You do that once, that's why I support the PLA. Thank you.

Rene Carrasquillo, Castle Concrete, 504 Frost Road, Northford, had the following comments: We hired 35 non-union . . . and top quality employees. Normally our work goes 60/70% on minimum prevailing wages, which is State jobs like the ones we're talking here and the remainder are private jobs. I stand in the presence of you and this public tonight to present our firm opposition to the PLA for these new schools. Our reason for this position is basically because we believe it's a violation of our sacred right to work, of our workers and ourself as employers. We strongly believe that the use of union or non-union workers doesn't make necessary of any difference on the performance or the quality of the work that is gonna be ahead of us. The guarantee for that will come from the general contractor, in this case the project manager and the architect. I don't believe that union workers or non-union workers are better or worse than the others. We are equals. We all share the same responsibilities, we all share the same obligation, but we also have the same rights. We also are different in many ways, of course, the union workers they're main loyalty is to the union and to

themselves. A non-union worker like in my company; the main loyalty is to our company, to myself. They do it that way because they know we are taking care of them properly, they make good salaries and they also enjoy fringe benefits very similar to the ones that the union workers enjoy. For some reason of our 25 employees, at least 20 of them have been working continuously for Castle Concrete for at least 10 years. Some of them have been working for 15. If they're staying it's for some reason and that reason is a good one. The way that we work, the way that union workers work is different to what we do on the job. The carpenter is a carpenter, a laborer is a laborer, and an iron worker is an iron worker. In our organization each one of my workers, let me make it short, my position is this, we are equals, we all pay taxes. These jobs come from public funds that come from our taxes. When you decide to go PLA you're serving a minority of union workers when you have a majority of workers unemployed and they need work. Thank you.

Scott Stewart, Stewart Mechanical, 1495 Thomaston Avenue, Waterbury, had the following comments: We started our business in Waterbury, we've been in business a little over 20 years, and we are a non-union contractor. Basically, we've been paying taxes in Waterbury as well as other non-union entities and we don't get a shot at the larger public work in town because of the PLA's and I don't think that that's in the competitive nature of how public bidding should go. Open competition for all bids is the American way and I don't know why union labor and open shop labor just can't compete on that basis. Thank you.

D'Archer Bartlett, 23 Southwest Road, had the following comments: I am seven years old and I go to Barnard School. Lots of people have been saying that my school will close. I would not like my school to close. All the teachers are very helpful, they are caring teachers and I love them all. The school is very special because they help the children in need go back on track. This school has taught me so much that when I grow up I know I'll be a smart person. The teachers will give toys or prizes when we have a good day or when we help. I want to help my school because my school helps lots of children. I will not like my school to close. Please keep Barnard School open for the children.

Carol Dickey, 23 Southwest Road, had the following comments: That was my child. Midway through the school year in 2007 I brought my older daughter to Barnard school for the first time. She and her younger sister had come to our home just three days earlier having spent the previous three and a half years moving about the foster care system. In the first six years of her life, life had taught my daughter that she really didn't matter much. When we walked through the front door on Barnard School that first day, Mr. Pannone was there to welcome us, he had been expecting us. He called my daughter by her name and he personally led her to her classroom, he introduced her to her teacher, and then he stayed with her until he saw she was comfortable. On that day when the school principal showed a terrified little six year old girl that yea, she really did matter, he changed her life. I believe that his gesture changed my daughter's life forever. Ours is not an isolated story but one that characterizes the culture that exists within Barnard School. Every child is shown that she matters. Every child knows that he counts. I know that this is so because I have now sent four children to Barnard School. According to research reported by America's Promise Alliance, there are five essential resources, five promises that children need in order to succeed academically, socially, and civically. They are caring adults, safe places, a healthy start, effective

education, and opportunities to help others. Every single day the teachers and staff at Barnard School work tirelessly with students and their parents to affect the promises that will nurture our children's success. As parents, we want our children to know that they matter. We want our children to have every opportunity to achieve individual success. There is a positive relationship between school stability and academic performance. The Educational Testing Service has reported that forced mobility is negatively correlated to achievement. That is when all the other variables are accounted for; children who are forced to change schools are more likely to have lower levels of achievement. Other research suggests that stability may be even more important to children in elementary school because of the critical learning that takes place during this period. Please, give our children the opportunity to realize their best. Don't put them at a greater disadvantage. I urge you not to displace the dozens and dozens of families that are currently a part of the Barnard tradition. Please keep Barnard School open. Our children really do matter. Thank you for hearing me.

Don Ouellette, R & L Acoustics, Inc., 30 Ernest Avenue, had the following

comments: I've been in business since 1984; I'm a Principal at R & L Acoustics in Naugatuck since 1991. We are an open shop, non-union acoustical ceiling and dry wall subcontractor. We predominately do commercial work, with an awesome resume and a long list of projects that we have completed over the years. Just to name a few would be the UConn Student Center in Storrs, Connecticut, a multi-million dollar project. More recently it would be the summer work at Derby High School, a multi-thousand dollar project, and Kaynor Tech High School here in Waterbury, another multi-million dollar project. So as you can see, we're more than qualified and have plenty of experience, plenty of manpower, and a sense of urgency to finish these types of projects on schedule. I have a couple of comments regarding the unionized labor force and PLA's. They would have you believe that they, and they only, can give you qualified manpower force that you would need to do a project, that's a fallacy. They would have you believe that they, and they only, can deliver a large quantity of manpower needed to do a job, that's a fallacy. They would also have you believe that any company that is not union hires only illegals, that's a fallacy. We do a lot of prevailing rate work; we have never encountered any of these types of scenarios. The reality of it is that prevailing wage laws are set in place to make unions and non-unions compete. So why have PLA's? You are limiting the competition. The fact is that we can compete with unions. I employ a lot of people throughout the State, many of my employees come right here from Waterbury. I hope that you will open up the bidding so that my men and women have a chance to work here.

In closing, I would like to address the Board members. I'm a long time-resident, almost 50 years. I've paid taxes for all of 30 of them. Waterbury politics are unique, to say the least. Every so often, we make national news, usually not for anything good that we've done but you, as Board members, have the opportunity and a large responsibility tonight to show the common Waterbury taxpayers that you can save them money, you can do the right thing for the residents of Waterbury, you can make a difference. This should not be union versus non-union; both of us are qualified to do the work. It should be about saving a lot of money for the City of Waterbury. Please vote "no" to PLA's. Thank you for your time, God bless you all.

Frank Juliano, 925 Oronoke Road, had the following comments: I'm an apprentice carpenter out of the Local 24. I joined in February on the PLA job at Gilmartin and since

then I have been working for the past eight months. I think the PLA is a great opportunity for other City residents to get jobs. With the benefits and retirement, it's a good opportunity. Vote PLA, thank you.

Lelah Campo, Associated Builders and Contractors of Connecticut, had the following comments:

I know you've all heard so much on this issue and you heard from me just a week ago, so I'm gonna keep it extremely brief. I think what you have before you is two stories – one group is asking for an exclusive, they're asking that only they be allowed to set foot on the projects that all of our tax dollars are going to build. The other group is just asking for an equal shot. The State, and many advocates before us, have insured that contractors have to compete on the same playing field when it comes to wages, we all will pay union scale, and the State Department of Labor will enforce it. OSHA, to check safety, Department of Consumer Protection that makes so many of our trades licensed, now the DOL ensures that all contractors have safety training in place. These are put in place so that we can all compete equally. And so the choice is simple, either bid the project with a union only agreement that will only allow union workers or what we're asking for is just give us all a chance to bid the projects and to compete for them, not shut anyone out. All of the fine tradespeople before us that spoke that are from the unions, we want them to have just as much of a shot as we do and that's what we're looking for, an equal opportunity to bid these projects. Thank you.

Dennis Rivera, 117 Bellevue Street, had the following comments:

I'm an apprentice two years with the Bricklayers and because of the union and the PLA, I have been able to work at Gilmartin, Duggan School, City Hall. And you know, I have a trade and it didn't cost me. It's equally competitive but we get training, we get a lot of training. And what I mean is next week, I'm going to related training which is we go back to school, constantly being trained, constantly being taught, and our skill gets better and better all the time. Not just out on the field, but in the schools. We give back to the community, we're constantly doing community work for daycare centers, boy scouts, churches, this is what the union has done for me. Just the pride in the work that we did in the school, my kids asked me "daddy, you worked at Gilmartin?", they take pride in it, I take pride in it, it stays here. When I'm able to give them 25 cents, 50 cents so they can go to the bodega and buy juicy juice, a bag of chips – Stop and Shop don't sell no 25 cent bag of chips and no 50 cent juicy juice, I can do that, it stays in the community. So, just all that involved with the PLA and the union gave me the trade, gave me the skill, gave me the pride in the school, makes my kid proud, too. The fact that I got the related training that means, I got the journeymen on me all the time, in school plus on the field making sure that the work is good, the quality is there. We're all equal, you're right, but we take it a step further. Your apprentices are being trained, not just in the field but at school, we can give you academic, we can give you the theory, we can give you the blueprint behind it because this is what they teach us in the union, this is what they enforce, and this is constant training and schooling, that's the difference. Nobody's better but we got that, we got that training, we got that schooling. So when you turn around and you look at me, you know what you got and it's verified, it's documented hours. This is what the union has done for me with the PLA. Hartford, New Haven, Bridgeport, they make sure they keep their residents working, I can assure you, if a squirrel . . . on the site, they'll tell you about it, it's as simple as that, Waterbury got to keep their own working. Thank you.

Athena Wagner, 1558 Highland Avenue, had the following comments: My issue is, and always has been, educating the children first. And I'm just here to say I attended a seminar where the speaker was Alberto Retana from the U. S. Department of Education and he stated that money is available and options are available to turn the schools around. Connecticut has 185 failing public schools; Waterbury has between 19 and 22 failing public schools out of 30. The Federal Government has issued 3.5 billion dollars to target the lowest five percent of failing schools across the Country. Each state can submit an application stating how they will apply the money and how they're gonna produce quality and quantity. If their application is approved, they will be allotted two million dollars a year for three years. The requirements fall under four models. The first model is close the school because every student has a right to a better education. Right now Connecticut, there's none. The second model is restart, which is charter schools, starting a charter school which has a rigorous review process. Right now in Connecticut there is one. The third model is to transform the school, replace the principal if the principal has less than three years with no progress. The evaluation system for teachers has to be tightened. Waterbury missed The Race to the Top twice because the evaluation system was too weak. Longer school day extended, I know that's a big union issue with teachers, we're not talking about teachers, we're talking about educating these children first. The second part is a full time community liaison that encompasses a wrap-around of services such as the social ills that these children deal with coming to school every day. There's seven in Connecticut right now and this particular model is something that a superintendent would need to take very seriously. And the fourth model is the turn-around, principal and half the staff is changed, not replaced, not shifted to another school to do the same poor job, but replaced. There's four in Hartford, there's two in New Haven. The State can, any state can choose not to apply for this money. If they choose not to apply for this money, then 20% of their money toward education will be withheld. And I saw a sign over here, I don't know the lady's purpose, but it says if you think education is expensive, try ignorance. I don't know what your purpose here is but I agree with that sign 100%. If you think education is more expensive than sending these children down a river of failure is even more expensive for you, for me, for everybody in here because our tax dollar pays for them to sit in a prison cell or an early grave. Thank you.

Jeffrey Marrow, President of the Waterbury Building Trades, had the following comments: My local union Local 611 is a property owner and taxpayer in the City of Waterbury. I'm here tonight to, I guess a very important decision is gonna be made tonight, I should start with that, is the construction of two schools to take place in the City of Waterbury. As you can see we brought people out tonight, unlike last week, to talk about the opportunity they've gotten in the City of Waterbury through apprenticeship. What better way for the young men and women in the City of Waterbury to be able to become citizens and homeowners in the City of Waterbury with the ability to earn a living through the apprenticeship programs of the building trades: You heard a couple of people speak from the other side of the aisle tonight, from Castle Concrete, I'm sure he's a fine contractor. Unfortunately, if he was to bid on one of your schools, he does not have the apprentices' and the laborers' jurisdiction of work. So that means no laborers for his company would be able to work on these projects because he flat doesn't have an apprenticeship program. If these jobs go non-union and you have an ordinance in this town that says that a certain percentage of the workers will be of apprenticeship whether they're union or non-union, which everybody has the right to bid on these projects, their choice is not to bid. That's not our choice,

that's their choice. But if an excavation contract is let out in the City of Waterbury, the first two craft on the job – the laborer and the operating engineer, there will be no apprentices; there is no registered apprenticeship program on the other side except for a union for laborers and operating engineers. So the people that pour the floors, the people that put the asphalt down, the people that put the pipes in, are all journey workers and there are no apprentices. You heard the impact these schools have made on the apprentices of Waterbury, it's a fine impact, they are making a living, they have insurance, they are working towards pension, and they are getting educated free of charge, absolutely free of charge to be the best in the industry as far as when they come out as a journey worker. There's no better than a union-trained apprentice that comes into the field as a journey worker. Thank you very much.

Donna Vignali, 127 Daniel Drive, had the following comments: I come proudly before you as a voice of over 1,500 teachers in the Waterbury Public School District. Thank you for the opportunity to speak to you last week about the Education Jobs Fund Program. It seems that we have a difference of opinions. Teachers have lobbied for this money, because of our work, the City sees itself with an additional 6.6 million dollars. That's almost five times as much as the newly founded City surplus of 1.4 million dollars which Mayor Jarjura sees no need to save. I was surprised to read about the surplus since we were told repeatedly during negotiations that there was absolutely no money for teachers. What amazes me is how this district has never had a problem finding the money to give to the parochial schools for textbooks. As a matter of fact, you even increased the amount to \$50,000 this year, 10 thousand more than last year. Tonight I am asking, again, that you give the teachers a 2.5 increase as in a bonus which would cost 2.3 million of the 6.6 million the district has received. Telling the teachers you don't have the money this time isn't going to work. This money is to be used for education jobs, i.e. teacher salaries for the 2010/2011 school year. As we said last week, this money is not to be used for school years three years down the road, but that's exactly what Central Office's budgets, as proposed, does with this money. The law is clear; all the money must be used by September 30, 2012. We are here tonight to watch this vote. We are here tonight because we want this Board to know that we are the professionals who are on the front lines teaching our kids, collecting data, collaborating, buying essential supplies with our own money, giving encouragement when needed, and handling the new initiative of the week. Most of us are juggling two jobs to make our mortgage payments, pay our taxes, and feed our families. Commissioners, before you vote tonight, consider the message you will be sending to these dedicated professionals. Thank you.

Dennis Finnegan, 125 Middle Street, had the following comments: I work for . . . acoustics, Local 24 Carpenters' Union. I've been in the union since 1984, before there was a Good Jobs for Waterbury Ordinance. I remember when I talked to the Board of Aldermen about that and all of a sudden I'm working here, in this building, and they kept the numbers up on that. I worked on City Hall; they kept the numbers up on that. The only reason I'm working there is because I'm a resident of the City of Waterbury and I see all these people that I saw in Stamford, Norwalk, and Bridgeport, and Hartford, that I would work with in the business. No carpenters, plumbers, fitters, laborers. Now I'm working in Waterbury I see all these guys live in Waterbury, so they don't have to drive 9,000 miles a year just going back and forth to work. The misconception is you're creating new jobs by building these schools. You're not creating new jobs; we're already out there working for somebody. It's the same players playing the game and

we're just the players, but we live here. There's plenty of guys in the union that would love to work in Waterbury, that live in Waterbury, but they can't because they're not on a PLA job with a Good Jobs for Waterbury Ordinance. And as far as the non-union guys, I worked in City Hall, a lot of non-union guys, I love you, we all work the same, we're all doing one thing, making our bosses rich, that's all we're doing. So I don't see how you're gonna save the City of Waterbury any money. If the City of Waterbury wants to save money building buildings and schools and stuff like that, what you got to do is lose all the management, get a turnkey GC, general contractor, and a clerk of the works like it was when I got into the business and you'll save a ton of money. Thank you.

Michael McKay, 131 Atwood Avenue, had the following comments: I got into the union right after high school and I've been working fairly steady for the last three years at the Waterbury schools – Kennedy and Crosby, recently Gilmartin and the Enlightenment School. And I'd like to continue to work in my hometown, that's it.

Franklin Reyes, 202 Hubbell Avenue, had the following comments: I'm a member of IBEW Local 488 and I'm currently working at the Duggan School, which thanks to the PLA at the Duggan School, I was out for eight months and, luckily, I was able to go on thanks to the PLA. That's it.

Orlando Santiago, 181-2 Villagewood Drive, Waterbury, had the following comments: I've been living here for about 26 years and I just want to say that I'm very thankful and grateful to have been given the opportunity to work on a PLA job. I represent Local 777, the Pipefitters and Plumbers Union. Like I said, I just want to say that I'm very thankful for that. I heard a statement earlier about you know the differences between union and non-union; I worked non-union for about two years for four different contractors, out of those four, three of them never registered. That is a big problem with non-union contractors. I'm not saying they all do it, but it did happen to me and I have yet to meet one of my brothers or sisters, Local 777, that hasn't been registered. It's a great school, I've learned so much throughout that and I just want to say vote PLA.

John Gotlibowski, 26 Macauley Avenue, had the following comments: I'm a . . . Local 40 member. Because of PLA's, last year I had the opportunity to go work at Gilmartin School instead of being laid off. He was my apprentice, kept us both working during through tough times. I'm also an instructor at the Local 40's Union school at night. They've sent me to school for training to better train our members. If there's an issue that comes up, we train them to be on top of it. I'm all for PLA's.

My wife is also a teacher in Waterbury. I'm for the bonus for them because it won't even repay on what she spent on her science classroom for these past couple of years, it won't even touch it. There's no budget for her science classroom. Every experiment she does comes out of my pocket. Thank you.

Scott Vaughan, 120 Bateswood Road, had the following comments: I'm an apprentice at City Hall doing trim carpentry and vote PLA, thank you.

Alderwoman Petteway, 1680 Meriden Road, had the following comments: Thanks for allowing me to speak. And I've been listening to the conversations and I can say when I was on the Board of Education I did vote for the PLA. When seeing how the

PLA has helped so many of the citizens in Waterbury to get gainful employment, buy houses, build their homes, and they've become apprentices, that's a really, really good thing. But my thing today is to say that with millions of public funds at risk and no mechanisms for accountability, there's a slender thread of hope that can be broken. Why not give all of the citizens of Waterbury an opportunity to get a job and work on some of these schools? Accountability means including the City and the public in thinking about what needs to be done. I don't have a problem with the employees in the PLA, I don't have a problem with that, I think it's great that people are trained at little or no cost. Respect and dignity is gained through when folks have a job. The City of Waterbury, unemployment, I think it's over nine percent. And the unemployment throughout the Country is very high. There are a lot of people out there struggling, why can't we open it up for both sides and everybody? After all, everybody's money is green, and everybody pays their taxes. A good job is not simply a good pay but the respect you feel at the end of the workplace and how you feel when you go home and how this reverberates in the community. And what the contract manager should keep in mind when dealing with a diversified list of contractors who exercise fairness in hiring the citizens who are non-union – painters, landscapers, well, I don't know what you call them, but the ones that put the wall. Clearly the struggle of folks who are trying to find work is a struggle of the community. It just makes good economic sense, and it definitely makes moral sense. Thank you.

Vincent Dogramatzis, 456 Prospect Road, had the following comments: I'm part of Local Union 48 and I haven't had the opportunity to work in Waterbury yet but I'd love to. And vote PLA's, I guess. Thank you very much.

Lisa Whidbee, 37 Spread Oak Lane, had the following comments: I'm a third year apprentice representing Local 424 Ironworkers. A little known black history fact, in 1982 my mother, Louise Whidbee, became Waterbury's first African-American woman to become a Police Officer for the City of Waterbury. That history would not have come to pass if it wasn't for affirmative action and the push of the NAACP and other supporters who had asked her to go ahead and be brave enough in that time, that era, with the climate that it was, to go ahead and take the exam. Here it is in 2010 and we're discussing PLA's, well without PLA's I wouldn't be employed myself. PLA's are important because without it, the doors would be shut and slammed, locked, and keeping minorities and other women out. We can't allow to have this thing go on and on and on. Whatever the issue is, whatever, if it's Affirmative Action or PLA's, it's time that we do the right thing and not have to come back here decades later discussing the same issues over and over again. Thank you.

Bernard Bailey had the following comments: I wanted to talk to you regarding two issues from a substitute teacher's point of view. Firstly, the decision to lower the requirements for superintendent. It's hard to understand why the Board would or may consider the change. However, I am not sure what everybody's opinion is yet, but I would like to see the most educated future leader lead our City schools that will hopefully motivate all staff and reward us all to help close the achievement gap.

Secondly, Waterbury has the highest unemployment rate. It would be more beneficial to residents to open up City construction projects to non-union workers during these hard times. There are a good number of residents that attend the Adult Education Program, Kaynor Tech, and other programs pertaining to painting, electrical, plumbing,

and so forth. While they need to find work right here in the City of Waterbury. In respect to our unions, they have their positive benefits. If it is not too hard to incorporate, can construction jobs be offered to non-union workers also? And I also want to take this time to thank the Board and the public for giving support for the North End school being named after an African American. Can we please continue the great work by adding a multi-cultural theme if there isn't one already set? I visited other schools in New Haven and the pictures in this place are beautifully amazing. I would not mind working with the Board and others with selecting pictures and arts. Board members, let's give our neighborhood students a refreshing focus in education. Thank you.

Wilfredo Erba, 36 Hillview Avenue, had the following comments: Right now I'm currently in first year apprentice as a glazer and I got to say before union I worked for three and a half years as an 18 wheeler driver, I was driving trucks all over the Country, and to tell you the truth, I never had a raise in three and a half years when I was working. Before that I was working in all kind of factories, and the best thing ever, union, I was unemployed for almost a year because of the economy and never had a chance. I was looking for a job really hard all over the place, never got anything. I went to WCCI, Waterbury Construction . . . Ray Sullivan, he helped me so much, he sent me with a group of eight guys over to our union and we did a one week course where they teach you all three trades and you choose which one would you like, you fill out an application, and they put you to work. The next week, after I went there, they called me in, I've been working in Waterbury, I worked at the Enlightenment School, I'm working on Duggan School right now; it's the best thing ever. They train you, they teach you everything, they're even teaching me how to manage my money if I ever get laid off I can live with half of the check so that way my unemployment paycheck will be enough to actually pay all my bills and have enough money to save in the bank. So I got to tell you the best thing ever – union. Vote yes, please. Thank you.

Marina Villot, 39 Eastern Avenue, had the following comments: I've been in the union for a year, I'm an apprentice. It's a great opportunity for me, I'm a single mom with two teenagers and it makes me proud knowing that I'm working hard at something and kids can look at me and say my mom is working hard, too. So all I got to say is vote PLA.

Gino Pelletier, 690 Greystone Road, Plymouth, had the following comments: I've been in the construction industry for 26 years. I started at 18 years old. I've seen every side, union, non-union, my experience has been and my training has been from non-union. I've seen good and bad, whether it was union or non-union. What made a job was the GC, the architects, the people running it like yourselves, the Board of Education, there's guidelines to be met on the State and everybody's got to follow them. You can't, if you don't put people through training and your guideline in that contract is to do that then you got to pay consequences. It doesn't matter if you're union or non-union, that's the way it's set and you've got to follow guidelines. Now you guys have a really hard decision to make tonight, you've got to decide if 50 people are going to eat and 50 are not or everybody's gonna come to the table and eat. So you got to make a decision to make sure that everybody gets a chance to really take a look at what's out there and what the City has to offer and give a chance for everybody to come in. If you're a union, you're restricted on doing that. If you're non-union, everybody's welcome, everybody's welcome to get a fair chance, put your bids in, the lowest number

gets it. These are the guidelines, these are the contracts, and this is what you have to follow. I mean it's plain and simple really, but you guys have a hard decision to make tonight and I hope that after all is said and done that everybody gets a chance to come in and puts their prices on the table and make sure that they save the City a lot of money. That's really the guideline. And with the non-union being offering what we offer, we tell everybody, come to the table, you're welcome, everybody gets to eat. I mean that's basically what it comes down to is make sure that everybody in this room doesn't, whether it's one people and one person or two person, say okay you don't get a chance to eat, we do. It's just not fair. So I give you guys all the credit, I hope you make the right decision.

Jeremy Zeedyk, 9 Edgewood Street, Cromwell, had the following comments: I'm a sheet metal worker from Union Local 40 and I represent people, I represent labor. The other side of the table, unfortunately tonight, almost to a person is representing the owners; they're begging you for a job so they can make profit. We are asking you for a job so we can feed our families, so that we can take the benefits that we earn and continue them on through life as we grow from an apprentice to a retiree on a fixed income, paying taxes, continuing it on and on, the circle of life, so to speak. One of the other startling things I noticed was I don't believe the other side brought one apprentice to speak to you, nearly every one of ours was an apprentice. Just looking for an opportunity to start a career, to get certified, to get licensed, to go through the proper training and not have to pay a fortune for the training like the one woman had said, to get the bill at the end to say it's not really worth much but thanks for paying for it. We're asking to continue on education, careers. Please vote for the PLA, it will guarantee the benefits stay in the community. Thank you.

Pedro DePaiva, 47 Devonwood Drive, had the following comments: I'm a member of IBEW 488, currently employed by Dinto Electric; I'm working at the Enlightenment School here in Waterbury. Without PLA's, I probably wouldn't be at work, so vote for PLA. Thank you.

Donald Emanuel, 19 Springdale Avenue, had the following comments: I'm here to ask you to vote "no" to PLA. Most of my adult life I've been an electrician and a Waterbury taxpayer. I don't think it's right to shut anybody out of public work when it's public money that's paying for it. I'm sorry; I just can't understand it for the life of me. I've got absolutely nothing against the unions; I even worked in the union, in the past, myself. I respect everybody on both sides but you know what, I just can't understand why one party should be shut out and not even given the chance to compete against work that's paid for by public money. I just don't understand it. The other thing I'd like to say is I worked my way up in electrical from an apprentice to a foreman to a road foreman to a department manager and now project manager; I have many electricians working under me. Let me tell you something, there's a lot of good people out there. I may be on both sides, but I can tell you from my experience, there's a lot of good electricians that are out there that are non-union. We go through the State apprenticeship program, just like everybody else, you need it to take your test, it doesn't matter if you're union or not. Like I said, I got nothing against anybody just keep it open, leave it fair so that everybody has a chance to work. Thank you.

Upon a motion by Commissioner Stango and duly seconded by Commissioner Sweeny, it was voted unanimously to return to the regular order of business at 7:52 p.m.

HAYES: Motion made and seconded. All in favor, opposed. We'll return to our regular order of business and call on Dr. Snead for the Superintendent's Report.

SUPERINTENDENT'S REPORT: Dr. Snead read and distributed the following report:

As you are aware, we had to close down Driggs School last Thursday due to water leaking into the building during the rainstorm. As a safety precaution, the school was also closed on Friday to give everything a chance to thoroughly dry out. I would like to thank school staff, our bus companies and other district officials in working together to assure that our students arrived home safely during the storm. Classes resumed today.

Two of our schools are being used as a model site for PBIS (Positive Behavior Intervention Support) by a team from Davies Career and Technical High School in Rhode Island. Both Wilby and North End Middle School have been chosen to be visited in the near future by the group due to their great success with the outcomes of implementing PBIS. The close proximity of North End to Wilby and how the transitioning of students who have been part of a PBIS system, have transferred those "expectations" into the high school setting will be observed.

Wilby High School will be holding an awards ceremony tomorrow morning for students who participated in this past year's Project Opening Doors AP program. The ceremony takes place at Wilby beginning at 9 a.m. with a breakfast for invited guests. The ceremony itself begins at 9:30 a.m.

There will be a Special Committee Workshop this Wednesday evening for the purpose of discussing charter schools. The meeting is at 6 pm at Kennedy High School in the media center.

This Thursday is an early dismissal day for students. Elementary and high schools will hold Open House. The middle schools will have teacher collaboration time.

The Bridge to Success Partnership will be holding its Youth Summit – "What's New With Our Youth" – on Wednesday, October 20, from 5 to 7:30 pm at the Palace Theater. This event will include a presentation from America's Promise Alliance for the 100 Best Communities for Youth and a presentation on the results of last year's youth survey.

During this past weekend at the National Center for Education Research and Technology Conference, I had the opportunity to interact with Assistant U.S. Secretary of Elementary and Secondary Education, Dr. Thelma Melendez de Santa Ana. I was pleased to learn that the U.S. Department of Education is proposing a change in the re-authorization bill for the ESEA (Elementary and Secondary Education Act) to make use of a growth model and give credit to school districts that demonstrate improvement over a period of years.

PRESIDENT'S COMMENTS: Just under my comments, I will be recusing myself so I can speak to the important issues on the Agenda under the Committee of the Whole.

At this point I will ask if there's anyone here wishing to remove anything from the Consent Calendar.

President Hayes proceeded to read the list of Consent Calendar items.

8. CONSENT CALENDAR

Upon a motion by Commissioner Sweeney and duly seconded by Commissioner Stango, with Commissioner Theriault voting "no", it was voted to approve the Consent Calendar, Items 8.1 through 8.14, as listed:

- 8.1 With the approval of the Committee of the Whole, the Superintendent of Schools recommends approval of the School Inspector's Office Reorganization Plan, as attached.
- 8.2 With the approval of the Committee of the Whole, the Superintendent of Schools recommends approval of the revised districting for Gilmartin School, as attached.
- 8.3 With the approval of the Committee of the Whole, the Superintendent of Schools recommends approval of a new afterschool program for Wilson School entitled "Homework and Hip Hop". Program shall be funded by the Family Resource Center Program Grant.
- 8.4 With the approval of the Committee on Grants, the Superintendent of Schools recommends permission be granted for various principals/teachers to apply for the 2010 Target Field Trip Grant, as attached.
- 8.5 With the approval of the Committee on Grants, the Superintendent of Schools recommends approval to apply for the Clorox Power a Bright Future Grant for Walsh School.
- 8.6 With the approval of the Committee on Building, the Superintendent of Schools recommends approval of the ED042/Phase 3 for the Duggan School Project (State Project #151-0252 RNV/E).
- 8.7 With the approval of the Committee on Schoolhouses, the Superintendent of Schools recommends approval of the Educational Specifications for the Bucks Hill School Elevator Project.
- 8.8 With the approval of the Committee on Schoolhouses, the Superintendent of Schools recommends approval of the Educational Specifications for the Wendell Cross School Elevator Project.
- 8.9 With the approval of the Committee on Schoolhouses, the Superintendent of Schools recommends approval of the formation of a Building Committee for the purpose of carrying out the "Sprague School Roof Replacement Project". Such Committee to be made up of Mary White, Paul D'Angelo, Jose Morales, Neil O'Leary, and Ann Sweeney.

- 8.10 With the approval of the Committee on Schoolhouses, the Superintendent of Schools recommends approval of the preparation of schematic drawings and outline specifications for the purpose of carrying out the “Sprague School Roof Replacement Project”.
- 8.11 With the approval of the Committee on Schoolhouses, the Superintendent of Schools recommends approval to file a grant application for the purpose of carrying out the “Sprague School Roof Replacement Project”.
- 8.12 With the approval of the Committee on Schoolhouses, the Superintendent of Schools recommends approval of the Educational Specifications for the Sprague School Roof Replacement Project.
- 8.13 With the approval of the Committee on School Activities, the Superintendent of Schools recommends approval the use of school facilities by school organizations and/or City departments, as listed.
- 8.14 With the approval of the Committee on School Activities, the Superintendent of Schools recommends approval of the use of school facilities by outside organizations and/or waiver requests, as listed.

HAYES: Motion made and seconded. All in favor, opposed.

THERIAULT: Opposed.

HAYES: At this time I will turn over the leadership of the Board to Vice President White (7:59 p.m.).

10. COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Item #10.1

HAYES: Ladies and gentlemen, with the approval of the Committee of the Whole, the Superintendent of Schools recommends the request of the Waterbury Teachers' Association to receive a 2.5% bonus for the school year 2010/2011 utilizing the Education Job Fund Grant, be approved. Respectfully submitted and **SO MOVED**.

HARVEY: **Second.**

WHITE: Discussion. Commissioner Flaherty.

FLAHERTY-MERRITT: During the 2009/2010 school year, I, as a member of the Negotiations Committee for the Waterbury Board of Education, through the process of collective bargaining and eventually arbitration, a contract was awarded for the teachers represented by the WTA. This is a fair and equitable process by which I was a member of a Committee which made agreements and not votes on individual proposals. If I were to vote today on this 2.5% increase my vote would be outside the rule of the established negotiation process. In effect, my individual vote could directly impact a family member's salary. As a person of integrity, I must abstain from voting rather than vote on a sibling's salary, thank you.

WHITE: President Hayes.

HAYES: I think it's unfortunate that we're here tonight to have to discuss this. What we're faced with, currently, is a budget next year with a shortfall of about 3.7 million dollars if we get the same funding we got from the State the previous year. If there's anyone here that can guarantee that that money is even gonna be available to us for next year. The money that's been provided for us from the Federal Government, and I know it was worked on by teachers' unions throughout the Country, is gonna allow us to save jobs, is gonna allow us to keep our people employed. We have not had to suffer any layoffs, we do not want to do that, and this money will allow us to prevent that. I think it's unfortunate that you come in front of us, as your leadership has led you to believe, that somehow this is like free money that we could just give away. The fact of the matter is if we were to put that addition 3.7 million dollar tax burden on our taxpayers, we don't know where the City's gonna go. We are fortunate and we appreciate your support and your effort to get this money to allow us to help preserve your jobs and save your jobs. I'll have to vote "no" on this. Again, I think it's unfortunate that you put yourself in front like this because I think the general public understands what they're facing. And again, we went through a fair process, the State ordered mediation and arbitration, and we have an obligation for an increase of 3.7 million dollars next year and we hope to be able to meet that with these additional funds and be able to keep you all employed and serving our children the same great way you always have. So again, I'll have to vote "no" on this. Unfortunately I just wish we didn't even have to have this brought in front of us.

WHITE: Commissioner Stango.

STANGO: Thank you Madam President. Back in March, it was March 1, we listened to many teachers as they came forward before this Board to let us know that they thought we did not appreciate them, we did not respect them, they felt discouraged, and we also listened to the concerns that night. They also felt that they were shortchanged in their recent contract negotiations and in arbitration. This Board often speaks of financial losses of our teachers experienced with their pay freezes and with their step freezes. We talk about it, we say it was too bad for them, it was wrong for them, and I for one, and some others, sympathized with them that night and wish we could do more to help them. However, the arbitration award was what it was. Some of us blamed ourselves, some of us blamed the Mayor, some of us blamed the bargaining unit, some of us even blamed the lawyers and the arbitrators. There's no good that comes out of blame, only negativism and frustration. Now there seems to be a way to give teachers some kind of a bonus through the courtesy of our federal dollars to keep teachers employed and to help districts compensate teachers. I don't know if it's legal, I don't know if the money may be used for a bonus. There are many differing opinions; there are many questions to be answered after they're asked. I do believe the teachers have the right to petition some of the money, we'll let the powers-to-be decide if it's legal. If it passes mustard, then so be it. If it does not, then at least we all tried. I will support the request pending the outcome of the questions to be answered. Thank you.

D'ANGELO: I guess I get off a little easy tonight as I think the only Board member that has to actually go home and sleep with a teacher tonight. Obviously, I need to abstain as I have on all the other issues that affect your salary. But I do want to say for the

record, and this is not a reflection on our CFO by any means, but you know I knew this money was coming down the pike and I'm just a little bit disappointed in the manner in which it came to the 10 of us who have to actually vote on how to spend this money. I've got to be honest with you, I know I'm probably far from the smartest Board member here, I'm probably ninth or tenth on the list, but you know I don't know legally what the money could be used for. I hear a lot that it's to save jobs, I hear some people say it's to create jobs. I hear that it could only be used for teacher salaries, I don't know if that means to hire new teachers or for raises. But at our last Workshop for the first time, and I stand to be corrected, for the first time we were handed a budget on how that money was gonna be spent and now we have to vote on it. It didn't go through the Finance Committee of this Board, it wasn't talked about, it was just here you go Board members, here's how we're spending the money. I'm sure Paul Guidone has the best interest of the district at heart when his staff puts together the numbers, obviously, but I just think there should have been more input from this Board. You know if the money was like the stimulus money and it was intended to create jobs and put people who aren't working to work in the schools for two years, then that would have been something I, obviously, could have supported. I just don't like the way it went down, I don't like the fact the WTA President came to us last week and asked us, here, here's how we want to spend the money, and I know she prerequisite that with a letter and we said well, we'll vote on it next week. I mean not a lot of thought went into it, not a lot of give-and-take went into it, it was just we'll vote on it next week knowing full well that it was probably going to fail, but it would give the teachers a chance to come out and create some resentment towards this Board and make us look bad and make them resent us a little bit more and put a little bit more resentment in the classroom tomorrow morning. So, I just would have like to see it handled in a different way, that's all.

WHITE: Thank you Commissioner. Are there any other comments? Commissioner Harvey?

HARVEY: Commissioner D'Angelo, we have to stop agreeing like this, we're still, I guess, in the honeymoon stage. I have to agree with you, I am not pleased at the way this was handled. President Hayes, I think this is an opportunity, no I know this is an opportunity, for us to open up communications because last week what I saw was there was the WTA that had their opinion on how we should spend the money, and then we're presented with a budget by Paul. One opinion, WTA, was to give a bonus, for lack of a better word. The budget that was presented was to save jobs. So I think if we had had that communication prior to that, these folks could have been home preparing for their classes tomorrow. But I think we need to just take advantage of this opportunity to open up communications, because I don't think we handled this too, too well. And that's all that I have to say.

WHITE: Is there anyone else?

O'LEARY: I just want to say a couple of words. And they won't be the most popular, but they will be the truth as to how I feel. And I'm not happy about taking a side on this, quite frankly, for the reasons just mentioned; however, I'm going to because I feel I have to. But I did want to mention a couple of sentences in an e-mail that I received a couple of days ago concerning this issue. One of the sentences was "the Board of Ed wants to ignore us". Well, quite frankly, I don't feel that way at all. Secondly, the next quote, "once again we will receive zero". Well, I happened to be part of some of that

negotiation, as well, and it was the decision of the WTA to go to arbitration, quite frankly, I wasn't exactly thrilled with the award, I thought it was a little on the light side for the WTA, but we all know when we go to arbitration that's what happens. The last quote, I think I take the most exception to, "let them look you straight in the eye and say no". I have no problem looking any of you straight in the eye, I know you're all good people, I know you're all good employees, I know you're dedicated, I know you care, I know that you're professionals, but I will say this, right now there are over 850 homes in the City of Waterbury that are in foreclosure. Right now we have the highest unemployment rate in the State of Connecticut, as a city, and we've had that for the last 10 years. Right now there are people lining up at soup kitchens to eat who have never seen the inside of a soup kitchen before. Right now there are people in the lock-up at the Waterbury Police Department who are under arrest tonight for stealing to provide for their families. So I have no problem telling you, I respect all of you, I have no problem saying that, I really, really do, but I will tell you this, when this proposal was first presented to us, if you recall, it was a 2.5% that was going to into salary schedule. And when that was brought up quickly it was changed to a one-time bonus. I don't feel good about this, but I'll tell you what, I don't think I, morally, have a choice here but to say no to you people and it's not because I want to, but it's just because all the circumstances I just mentioned here. So I have no problem looking you in the eye and telling you, I'm sorry, but you know what, I think we have a responsibility to everyone else in the City of Waterbury here who is out of work, unemployed, and in big, big trouble. So I'm sorry that you feel the way you feel because I can see it in your faces, but I speak the truth, I speak what's on my mind, I know you don't agree with me, so be it. Thank you.

WHITE: Commissioner Theriault.

THERIAULT: I think I'd be remiss if I didn't say a few words. Having been a teacher and an educator and having done the very jobs that these people are doing on a daily basis and knowing all too well how unappreciated I had felt when I was in the trenches, how I felt as I lonesomely walked the picket line and was sequestered down in the court house for 10 days until one o'clock in the morning; I know what it's like. If the Federal government had given us six million dollars and was gonna give use six million dollars every year, . . . item, I'd say pass it on. My problem is after we give the teachers bonuses what do we say to the firemen and the policemen? What do we say to the other people... let me finish, you can take the mic any time you want it, so what do we say to the other people? Okay, the Oversight Board was here and they did a dastardly deed to the teaching profession in this town, so much that many of our teachers have to leave the profession, go to the surrounding town, then come back with tremendous raises such as step nine. And I for one, not speaking for the Board, apologize for that because I think that's one more dastardly deed and slap in the face to all of you that have stuck around and hung it out. Now I know you've been frozen on step, I know that step; actually I always felt that steps were incumbent in the profession so that they didn't have to hire us all at step 12, they gave us incremental steps, thereby saving money during those 12 years. But some rocket scientist got the idea that you're not entitled to that, that they'll somehow go into those steps and include it as part of your salary and, unfortunately, the very people that don't understand education are the people that made that decision. Now bonuses during a time, if we were to give the bonuses and then two years later say there's gonna be a layoff of 300 teachers, I wonder how any one of us in this room would feel about the hindsight of that decision? I have often spoken on this Board, for the past five years or more, about the ECS

money being flat-funded here. Nearly 120 million dollars. The ECS money in this town has been flat-funded for the past three years. I know the rest of this Board won't say it, but we had enough fat in our budget that we moved things around for the past three years. But guess what, this Board of Ed has got to be on a diet now because we don't have any fat in the budget anymore, it's gone, we used up nearly 10 million dollars of it. But we didn't lose a job, we didn't lose a program, we didn't lose anything. What are we gonna do next year with the State's four billion dollar deficit and what if, what if the State comes in and says we're gonna cut your ECS money by 10%? Ten-percent of 120 million dollars is 12 million dollars. Just that 12 million dollars is a three to four mill increase in the City of Waterbury. Not counting the 3.7 million dollars we have in obligation towards the contract. I too, like Commissioner O'Leary, I'll say the truth, some it may not be popular but I'm gonna tell you something, in a town where people 12.5%, and I think if you count all the people that have stopped looking for jobs, all of the people throughout the town, it's probably closer to 20. When you look around this town, the town is actually imploding right in front of our eyes. We look at the North End, we look at the South End, we look at areas of town, 852 foreclosures in two years and that's not counting this year. You know if you don't have the taxpayer money, you really can't fund anything. And I'm not saying that you don't all deserve the raise, God knows you do, but this Board has a fiscal responsibility with this money to save the jobs as President Hayes said. And whether you like it or not, I think we need to save the jobs and not give the bonuses and then layoff people next year or the year after, to the tune, cut programs, cut people, cut their livelihood, at the expense of sharing the wealth or giving the bonus or laying off people. I won't be voting on this either because I have some children that work in the school system also, so I have to recuse myself as well. But I feel your pain, I feel your passion, but I think you really have to think it through as I have thought it through. I'm not doing this to be, saying these things to be punitive; I'm saying them more to be logical. Thank you very much for your kind attention.

SWEENEY: I'm gonna get this out of the way first. I was extremely put off by the remark, as was Commissioner O'Leary, to "look you in the eye and tell you no" because as I sit here today I can look you in the eye and tell you no as I did look SAW in the eye and tell them no. And as I looked . . . not from me, I looked them in the eye, I told them no, I said no to the non-union salary increases, as well. I worry, too, that if we don't use this money to cover the salary increases that are already in the budget and contracted that what we will look at next year is less teachers in our classroom and that is something that this district has worked very hard not to have to do in the last several years. While districts around us have decimated their teaching force and have multiplied the students in their classrooms. And those are the things that worry me and 2.5 is a lot of money to pull out of that money when we know going forward we have steps, moving forward second year and third year, that we have to cover. It doesn't mean we don't want to give it to you, it never means that. It means what are we able to do going forward. Commissioner Theriault is right, we have been flat-funded through ECS through the last three years, we have been flat-funded on the City side. Can the State continue to flat-fund us? I'm not even sure they can do that. Can the City continue to flat-fund us? I don't know. What I do know is what we have today and what we can do with what we have today. I'm gonna throw out something extremely radical that I have thought about for the past week. I would like to amend the motion. I would like to **amend the motion to change the percentage to 1.5 and I would exclude the top step that is getting a raise this first year.**

HARVEY: **Second**

WHITE: All in favor of amending the motion.

SWEENEY: Roll call.

ROLL CALL VOTE ON AMENDMENT TO ITEM #10.1:

Yeas: Commissioners D'Angelo, Flaherty-Merritt, Harvey, Morales,
O'Leary, Sweeney, and White - 7
Nays: Commissioners Stango and President Hayes – 2
Abstentions: Commissioner Theriault - 1

CLERK: Seven, two, one – motion passes.

WHITE: Then we will be voting on the motion as amended.

SWEENEY: The motion was to amend the one-time bonus to 1.5% and to exclude the top tier, top step that is getting a raise this year.

WHITE: Discussion.

HARVEY: Commissioner Sweeney, we must be thinking alike because I was thinking of the same thing. So if we do anything, yea we should vote to lower the percentage. The President of the WTA said that she was open to anything, so let's go ahead and vote on this.

WHITE: Any other discussion? Commissioner O'Leary.

O'LEARY: I have several questions, one of which is the top step teachers got a raise this year but two zeros next year and the year after. Now I would think that you people might want to think about that. Do you want to divide that, do you want to; I see that as a problem, I really do. And I got to tell you, and listen to what Commissioner Stango has to say, you know I think that we need to do a little bit of legal research on this, honestly. I don't know that this, it's even more complicated now, Commissioner Stango, because you we're dividing up the workforce, we're gonna give a bonus to everyone that's under step 12 and then not give anything to step 12. They got a raise but they're taking a zero/zero and you guys took a zero and getting a step/step. Am I right?

SWEENEY: But they get a raise that carries through for the life of the contract.

O'LEARY: But they get a zero/zero year two and three.

SWEENEY: I would take a guess that that raise at that top step is not gonna outpace what some of these teachers are gonna see at 1.5 one time. You can do the numbers, but I would say it's not gonna outpace it.

HAYES: Under discussion, now we're into negotiations. The WTA came in front of us and asked us for 2.5% bonus, not for us to start figuring out and take away from some and give to others, reduce others. I mean I think some of us got to show a little backbone here and make a stand instead of trying to dance around this whole issue. The fact of the matter is the taxpayer of Waterbury can't afford the increase we already

have promised to people next year. We need the local dollars, these dollars to go to supplant or to replace the local dollars that we're not going to be able to get. That's the problem. It's not about us not wanting to put these dollars . . . again, we haven't talked about what 1.5% equals. Again, the people on top step already received an increase so I don't even know what that motion means, they don't get part of the bonus, I'm not really sure if you can clarify, as Commissioner O'Leary asked, I'm not sure exactly what that means since they already got an increase.

SWEENEY: That would be 1.5 if you don't give it to the top step; about 1.5, 1.6.

HAYES: Just for clarification. I think top step already got an increase. So what is it that they won't be getting? They're not getting anything next year anyways. Do we understand what that means? There's no increase, as Commissioner O'Leary said, they get a zero and a zero. It doesn't make any sense, respectfully, to put this forward the way we're trying to put it forward.

HARVEY: I'm gonna ask that we find out. We're sitting here trying to figure it out and we don't know what the figure is. So I'm gonna ask that we table discussion on this, determine exactly what type of figures we're talking about, and then come back and vote on it once we have those figures. I'm requesting that we table discussion and determine the figures involved in this so that we can make an intelligent vote on this request.

FLAHERTY-MERRITT: Point of order, it must be a postponement to a specific date.

HARVEY: So can we postpone it until our next regular meeting? I'm asking, nobody's answered yet.

HAYES: What we have in front of us is what they requested of us. If we vote this down, then we can bring forward anything we want afterwards. You don't have to put an amendment and table and do all those things. I mean if we agree we can't afford 2.5% then maybe you want to think that we can afford something else or you want to enter into negotiations with them on something else? We simply can start that by voting "no" to the 2.5% this evening.

HARVEY: I think that, first of all we're not entering in negotiations, President Hayes. Second, the handwriting is on the wall, if we vote to give this increase, 2.5, 1.5, we really don't know what the ramifications are monetarily. It is understood that in the next budget year, I hope, and I hope we don't have to do this, but if we are short, we have to move to layoff teachers. And I hate to say that, it kills me to even say that, but that's what I'm hearing. I'm hearing that they want the bonus, that's what I'm hearing. So we're trying to lessen the impact with the recommendation that Commissioner Sweeney made, we don't know what that impact is so before we vote I am asking that we table it until our next regular meeting and then we'll be able to determine that.

HAYES: Are we asking to table an amendment? Like I said, I think it's pretty clear that if we just simply no on the 2.5% then we can continue other discussions if you'd like afterwards. I don't understand it. Basically the motion that's being offered is saying no to that but offering something else. So let's say no to the first thing and then you guys decide what you want to do with the other stuff instead of complicating this whole thing

and adding amendments and wanting to table amendments. I mean it's pretty clear that we can't afford the 2.5%; I think we need to say that, and then if there are other proposals that want to be presented, they can be presented.

WHITE: Thank you.

O'LEARY: I'm more than confused. We voted to amend the motion already, eight to one, so we have to take some kind of an action.

WHITE: I call the question, the vote.

HARVEY: Attorney Mosley, can we get a clarification.

MOSLEY: If I may, if you wanted to postpone the vote, the proper motion is to lay it on the table and then you can take it up at a later date when the majority wants to. So the proper motion is to lay on the table.

HARVEY: I'd like to make a motion that we lay Item 10.1 on the table until such time...

SWEENEY: Point of order, and I don't mean to interrupt Commissioner Harvey, but Attorney Mosley, I'm gonna take issue with lay on the table. If you lay on the table, we have to take it up before the end of this meeting tonight. The correct procedure is to postpone either indefinitely to an assigned date or until our next regular meeting. Those are the three options.

HARVEY: I'd like **to postpone Item 10.1, as amended, until the next regular meeting which is scheduled for October 18, SO MOVED.**

SWEENEY: **Second.**

WHITE: Discussion. All in favor.

O'LEARY: Under discussion.

FLAHERTY-MERRITT: Point of order, there's no discussion on postponement.

ROLL CALL VOTE ON POSTPONEMENT OF ITEM 10.1 AS AMENDED:

Yeas: Commissioners D'Angelo, Flaherty-Merritt, Harvey, Morales,
Sweeney, and White - 6

Nays: Commissioners O'Leary, Stango, and President Hayes - 3

Abstentions: Commissioner Theriault - 1

CLERK: Motion to postpone passes.

D'ANGELO: We have a Workshop now between the next...

WHITE: It will be put on the Workshop.

Item #10.2

HAYES: Ladies and gentlemen, with the approval of the Committee of the Whole, the Superintendent of Schools recommends approval of the resolution to wit: The Board of

Education supports the establishment and implementation of a Project Labor Agreement, in the form and substance satisfactory to the Construction Managers employed by the Board of Education for the School Construction Program and the applicable Trades Council and its affiliated Local Unions, for the Waterbury High School Career Academy Project, **SO MOVED.**

STANGO: **Second.**

WHITE: Discussion. President Hayes.

HAYES: I'm gonna support keeping this project going forward as a project labor agreement, but I got to state I am somewhat disappointed in the amount of training that we had and a little short we came up with Waterbury residents. I would ask, implore you, to get more Waterbury people involved, get more Waterbury trained. I supported all these projects before and you're gonna see I'm not gonna support them all this time, but I am gonna support this one going forward. But I would ask you, and I'm gonna ask the others when I vote on the other issues, I want to see apprentices, I've been disappointed on the record of apprentices coming from non-union people. I've been disappointed at what we've gotten, but I am appreciative of the fact that you got as many as you did, but I believe we need to get more. We need more, we need Waterbury people as well. Like I said, we had a lot of people come up and speak on the non-union side, I don't even think there were a handful of Waterbury people . . . Northfield and all these places, that's not what we want, we want Waterbury people. We want you to hire Waterbury people, we want you to train Waterbury people, we want you to train more Waterbury people. So again, I would ask this Board to support a project labor agreement for this particular project, our high school academy, High School Career Academy.

WHITE: Any other discussion? Commissioner Stango and then Commissioner Sweeney.

STANGO: Thank you, Madam President. I'm not gonna delve into the issues of the pros and cons pertaining to the PLA's and open-shop bidding. We have heard them all before, we have debated them before. Actually, we've been through the debate seven times before for our previous seven school construction projects. We have discussed lowest prices for best quality work. We have discussed apprentice programs, Good Jobs Ordinances, prevailing wages. We have debated inclusion as opposed to exclusion. We all understand that everyone bids with an open-shop, but only unions may bid with PLA jobs. I believe that we are faced with this road block against open-shop for the last seven projects because of the philosophy of one national political party and not what's necessarily best for the job seekers and taxpayers of Waterbury. With all this aside, my point here tonight boils down to an issue of fairness. Seven projects have come before us; seven projects have gone to PLA only. How many more projects will Waterbury schools have to do before this Board gives the other side a chance? Will it be seven more, will it be, as the good book says, seventy times seven more? The time is now to apply open-shop bidding process, everybody wins, everybody gets a chance. We've heard that with our speakers, I truly believe it. Thank you.

SWEENEY: This project, in particular for me, needs to be open to all. This is an intradistrict magnet school open to every child in Waterbury who wants to attend, who

wants a chance at a career, at a career, or who wants to have what they need for a college education while they work that career. This, more than any of our projects, needs to be open because we need to start the groundwork now for the all inclusive nature of this project and this high school. And going forward, this is the place that we will look to to fill the trades in the future. To supply you with the trades people, with the apprentices, with the youth to carry on the trades that you have so carefully practiced throughout your lives. So this project in particular, I believe, needs to be open-shop, open opportunity to everyone. Yes, if there's a PLA the open-shop can bid, however, the tenants of the PLA and the shackles that it places on the open-shops make it financially impossible for them to bid on these projects. It makes it financially impossible for them to bid to make a profit, for their workers to stay with them and actually work on those projects. It's about an open opportunity for everyone. We heard from union apprentices tonight because the last seven projects have been PLA and those apprentices, union apprentices got the chance to work those jobs under the PLA. Four years from now, if we go open shop on this project, maybe we'll see some open-shop apprentices come back here and speak to us and tell us their stories and tell us how that opportunity that we gave them to work on this school, on this project, led to their lives being better and that is a story that I would truly look forward to hearing. So I would beg you to please, on this particular project that is so near and dear to my heart, to please go open-shop, please, no PLA on this one.

O'LEARY: Unlike Commissioner Stango and many of you, I haven't heard the last seven discussions because I just got here. So I want to first start off by thanking both sides for a very informative workshop last week and tonight's speakers, as well. You know, like the discussion 10 minutes ago with the WTA, there's gonna be some decisions here tonight that aren't going to make neither sides happy, in my opinion. But I do appreciate the work that has been done since I've been on the Board and that is at Duggan and Gilmartin. In particular, Gilmartin now that it's open and it's beautiful. And Duggan, we know there was some what I call the Duggan School debacle but we certainly can't blame that on the union people. And I feel that to not recognize the union would be to turn our back on the fine work that they've done in the City. However, given that said, I do believe with the economy and the climate and everything else that's going on in this world today that open competitive bidding doesn't hurt anyone, as well. So I, for one, am going to vote the way I'm gonna vote but one of the things that I am going to be expecting from both sides if this goes the way I hope it goes, is that we're going to be able to compare one project to another which we've been unable to do, at least under my watch. So that's where I stand.

WHITE: Are there any other comments? Commissioner Harvey.

HARVEY: I'm going to start off by saying competition is good and I think that, well we heard different viewpoints tonight we need to clear the smokescreen and look at the real reality here – what we're talking about is fairness, inclusion, and diversity. It's not union versus non-union, it's about fairness. When the tax bills are sent out, they're not sent out to only union; they're sent out to everyone, so there's inclusion. Our school district goals involve inclusion. Now I just want to address the issue of the apprentices. It's really good to see Waterbury residents as apprentices and I think that the union needs to be commended for that. I believe there were 84 apprentices as reported last week. But, the unemployment rate here in the City of Waterbury as of two or three weeks ago was 12.6%. You can double and triple that in the minority community. So we have people in the unemployment line that are left out when we go strictly PLA. I, being a

competitor, I'd like to compare the two and I'd like there to be fairness and I want to be able to compare work because we heard with the PLA it's better, we heard with non-PLA it's better. So I would like to compare the two. I would like to vote, we have three projects, I'm gonna vote the way I'm gonna vote and either way we need to step it up folks, we need to step this up because we still have people in the unemployment lines. We have three projects that should cut into that rate. So I'm gonna ask, let me just mention this about the apprenticeship programs. There is a, I've been informed, that a non-profit community agency is applying for an apprenticeship program. Now I'm not sure if they will be ready for the next project, but this will impact, not only on school projects, but also on any City project that we have. And again, if we open this up we create opportunity and this is what we should do. I will vote the way I will vote, but I'm voting for competition. Thank you.

WHITE: Thank you Commissioner. Are there any other remarks? Roll call vote.

THERIAULT: Clarification of the vote please. Yes means for PLA, no means non-PLA.

WHITE: Yes would be for a PLA, no...

O'LEARY: On the high schools.

WHITE: I'm sorry, yes; it's on the high school.

ROLL CALL VOTE ON ITEM 10.2:

Yeas: Commissioners Flaherty-Merritt, Harvey, Morales, O'Leary, White, and President Hayes - 6

Nays: Commissioners D'Angelo, Stango, Sweeney, and Theriault – 4

Motion passes 6 to 4.

Item #10.3

HAYES: With the approval of the Committee of the Whole, the Superintendent of Schools recommends approval of the following resolution, to wit: The Board of Education supports the establishment and implementation of a Project Labor Agreement, in the form and substance satisfactory to the Construction Managers employed by the Board of Education for the School Construction Program and the applicable Trades Council and its affiliated Local Unions, for the New Carrington Pre-k through 8 School Project, **SO MOVED.**

HARVEY: **Second.**

WHITE: Discussion. Commissioner Morales.

MORALES: I'd like to say, I believe in equal opportunity especially in Waterbury that I happen to have that I work on a program Welfare-to Work which I see so many people unemployed. One of the reasons is that right now jobs are very, very hard to get and I was there before and we should hire people from Waterbury. I believe there's a lot of people out there, especially minorities, that need a job. I believe that you can do it and the way that I was gonna vote is gonna show that I believe in hiring minority people from Waterbury. Thank you.

WHITE: Thank you Commission. Commissioner Stango.

STANGO: Thank you Madam President. Shortly after our last PLA open-bidding debate which was in May of '09 pertaining to the Alternative School Project, I had a chance encounter with a gentleman who owns a non-union electrical or lighting company, I can't remember which one it was, but he owns it in Waterbury. We were in the bank next to the CVS up in Robinwood and he said he recognized me from public TV broadcast so he asked me a question. He said why did the Board, time after time, vote for the PLA only project? Why can't his company be given a chance? He just wanted to know, he just wanted an answer. He told me his business is located in Waterbury, he pays taxes to Waterbury on his property; he pays taxes to Waterbury on his warehouse. He pays taxes to Waterbury on his trucks; he pays taxes to Waterbury on his equipment and his fixtures. He told me he pays taxes to Waterbury totaling tens of thousands of dollars. He asked a reasonable question, I thought. How come he can do business in Waterbury but he can't do business for Waterbury? I told him I agree with him, I told him to hold on we have new projects in the pipeline and I felt we were ready, as a Board, to give open-bidding a chance. It's time now to vote "no" on PLA only jobs, allow open bidding, and give everyone a chance to work. Thank you.

HAYES: This is where I entered that discussion that was started by Commissioner O'Leary and Commissioner Harvey. I guess I'm open to some competition. I'm open to allowing this particular project to go without the PLA. But I would ask the same of those of you that are going to be working on these projects. I want Waterbury residents to have careers as a result of these projects. That's what our main goal is. We believe, I believe all of the projects that have been done by the unions have been above reproach, they've done the job, they've done it on time, I don't think it's about wages because you have the prevailing wages. I got to tell you, I feel a little bit skeptical about the level of expertise, but you're gonna have the chance to show me. Hopefully we're gonna have some other projects down the pipeline and, as Commissioner O'Leary said, this is a chance for us to compare, and Commissioner Harvey. A chance for us to compare. But we want apprentices, we want Waterbury apprentices, we want Waterbury residents, we want minorities, we want women, we want everything that we've been able to provide, been provided for, through our PLA's. As Commissioner Stango and others have said, the economy being what it is, I would like to provide an opportunity for some other people who live here in town who are not part of a union begin to show us what they can do. We will then be able to determine better just what we do going forward. Quite honestly this will probably be our last high school we'll ever do but there will be other pre-k to eights, so I think a pre-k to eight school is the right place for you to have this opportunity and then we can compare the projects that have already been done which, again, we've been extremely pleased with except we don't believe it's provided us with the number of residents trained to have careers going forward. I expect that to happen from both sides. I look for that. I will support opening this one up without a PLA.

D'ANGELO: I was gonna try to be quiet on this one but... Historically I vote "no" on these things because I just don't think that I should have the ability to take the taxpayer money and dole it out in a manner that I think is appropriate being union only. I don't think that's fair, I don't think that's our job. So I normally vote "no" on these. But I guess I would just ask a rhetorical question, we had a past Commissioner on this Board, Commissioner Laccone, who pretty much said I voted for the other five PLA's, but I'm

warning you, if I don't see things happening the way they're supposed to be happening I'm not gonna vote anymore for PLA's. I saw an Alderman tonight come down who had the courage I guess, for the first time I think, if I'm not mistaken, to speak as far as an open process goes. And I know some of the Commissioners spoke tonight about what we want, we want Waterbury people, we want minority people, we want this, we want everything. Someone could correct me if I'm wrong, but the PLA's haven't really had an impact on what we want. From what I hear, from some of the public tonight, Waterbury people aren't getting the jobs in any more percentages than they are from the non-PLA groups. The editorial, I think in this past weekend's paper, spoke about the City Hall project that was non-PLA and what that accomplished was pretty much the same. I guess, rhetorically I'm just wondering are we fooling ourselves or do we think by voting for the PLA's, that we're getting all these things that we want and we sleep better at night, but you know when the rubber meets the road, it's really no different, they're professionals, they do a good job, that side of the room's professionals and they do a good job and the only difference is we're giving the taxpayer money to one side versus the other. That's all.

WHITE: Who has not spoken yet?

O'LEARY: As I mentioned earlier, for the people in the audience, I've only been on this Board for 14 months. However, I will disagree with Commissioner D'Angelo's assessment about the accomplishments of the PLA. The goals that were set forth by the Good Job Ordinance was not reached by the City Hall project which is a non-PLA project to some degree as well as the PLA projects. However, when the City and WDC got actively involved in policing and when Jeff Marrow came on board, it was around the time that I came on board, actually he came on board prior to that, inherited some issue. I will say that both sides worked diligently to get to the goals of the Good Jobs Ordinance and the apprentice program. Very slow in the beginning until this Board urged the WDC and the City to get involved. I'm sure you guys may recall those conversations a year or so ago. So there's a little bit of give and take on both sides. What I think is important to note here tonight, and I will be supporting a non-PLA at Carrington for a reason, as Mr. Marrow and Ms. Campo pointed out in their workshop discussion last week, we can set the bar higher and let's see what goes on here. We can set the bar higher in many different areas. And we can also see what the cost analysis is going to be with the two projects. So I think this is a fair compromise here. And I know we're not making all of you happy, but I think that deep down inside each of us is trying to do the right thing here and that's exactly what I'm hoping we're going to do. Thank you.

WHITE: Commissioner Harvey.

HARVEY: I support non-PLA on this project and the next project we're going to vote on. But the union, or non-union, should be able to hit the ground running. As Commissioner O'Leary stated that there was give and take, it was kind of slow then all of a sudden there was involvement to achieve the goals of Good Jobs. We should be able to hit the ground running and hire Waterbury residents, increase the apprentices that we have hired already and look forward to the finished project. So just so there's no mystery, I will vote non PLA for the next two projects. Thank you.

FLAHERTY-MERRITT: Under the guidance of Paul Guidone, we have had capital improvements and lists of projects after projects for the past, all the years I've been on

the Board and my only hope is, is if we open up the Carrington School Project to an open bidding process and don't go along with a PLA that we do get the results of this prior to our next round of construction, so that we can make a more educated decision on what the actual true comparisons are of a PLA k through 8 project, or pre-k through 8 project, versus an open bidding pre-k through 8 project. Again, we all know that's one of our goals in this district is to move towards developing all of our schools into that mode. So I really do hope we get this in a timely manner and the construction goes well so we can be much more educated than we are now instead of just throwing things wishy-washy to kind of make things fair.

WHITE: Thank you. Commissioner Theriault.

THERIAULT: There's no question that everyone should work and certainly we'd like to see all the people in Waterbury hired first. But that certainly doesn't have much compassion for the people that are from out of town either. So even though I'd like to see Waterbury residents work, I like to see everybody work. And I'd like to see everybody work whether they're union or non-union. It seems as though when we go with a union we say okay, everybody has to take a size nine shoe and some guy comes down and he has a size 12, you can't work because you're not a union guy and you don't fit into this pair of shoes. We certainly can't diminish the quality of work the PLA's have done. When you go through Gilmartin School and you see the kind of workmanship that went into that school and the quality and the effort that went into that, you can't take one thing away from the PLA. But in the last seven projects, they have been all PLA and the non-PLA's have not had an opportunity to even try on a pair of shoes. And that's unfortunate in this day and age whether you be a Waterbury resident or a Thomaston or Wolcott resident. I think you know it is, it certainly would behoove any union organization when they get a job if their members are out of work and they're a card carrying union member, well geese I'm gonna hire, if I were the guy, the shop steward, I'm gonna hire back the union guy first before I go out looking for others. And I think that's the nature of the beast and that's the way it should be because they pay their dues, they pay their membership fees, they pay their retirement fees, they pay all the other fees that are involved and they do offer a quality apprenticeship program. But I do feel it is time that we open this thing up so that the non-PLA's can really have the opportunity to prove themselves, step forward with the quality of work that we have seen from the PLA, and the kind of quality that we expect and had expected. Seven projects, not one PLA, so I think during these tough economic times I think, look at Gilmartin School when we came in over budget and we took that project and we separated it out and we sent it back out to bid and in doing so we save, not thousands of dollars, not hundreds of thousands, millions of dollars. So a little competition is a healthy thing. And I think it will be a healthy thing as we go forward. And with all due respect to both sides, the PLA and the non-PLA, and all the fine gentlemen that spoke and there's not a right or a wrong with regard to everyone speaking, it's the passion and the sincerity that they have. So there's not any right or wrong answers here. What we need to do is look at it from the point of, and I heard Commissioner Stango say this and Commissioner Sweeney say this, from the standpoint of fairness. And from the economic standpoint of where we currently stand with both Waterbury residents and people, in general, that are out of work. Thank you.

STANGO: Just briefly. I'm sitting here and I'm listening and I'm very happy that some people are coming around to see our side of the issue but honestly we already have seven projects to compare to. We can vote on these three projects tonight, could have

been all open-shop, and we'd still be able to compare them and we'd still have four more to catch up with. But anyway, thanks for seeing the light.

WHITE: Any more discussion?

HARVEY: Move the question.

SWEENEY: I haven't spoken but move the question requires a two-thirds vote.

WHITE: All in favor of moving the question?

HAYES: Without a second we don't need to vote on it.

THERIAULT: Point of order. A motion was made to move. Was there a second on the motion?

O'LEARY: No.

THERIAULT: Then if there's no second on the motion, there's no motion so it's a moot point and the question cannot be moved because the motion was made and not seconded. So, Commissioner Sweeney would have the floor.

SWEENEY: Commissioner Sweeney didn't ask for the floor.

ROLL CALL VOTE ON ITEM 10.3:

Nays: Commissioners D'Angelo, Flaherty-Merritt, Harvey, Morales, O'Leary, Stango, Sweeney, Theriault, White, and President Hayes - 10

CLERK: Zero to 10, motion fails.

WHITE: Item 10.4

Item #10.4

HAYES: With the approval of the Committee of the Whole, the Superintendent of Schools recommends approval of the following resolution, to wit: The Board of Education supports the establishment and implementation of a Project Labor Agreement, in the form and substance satisfactory to the Construction Managers employed by the Board of Education for the School Construction Program and the applicable Trades Council and its affiliated Local Unions, for the Wilby High School Science Suite Renovation Project, **SO MOVED.**

D'Angelo: **Second.**

WHITE: Discussion?

HAYES: I would just say as someone who had the opportunity to deal with this issue the last time and this time, I'd like to compliment both sides the way you handled it. Mr. Marrow, Ms. Campo, I believe we had a nice discussion, you brought the information forward and you see where we're going with this. But I do appreciate that and hopefully we can move forward with both these projects and we're gonna be comparing them

both and we're gonna make it real hard to decide who came out better, but I expect them both to come out better than what we've had in the past.

WHITE: Any other discussion? All in favor, roll call vote.

ROLL CALL VOTE ON ITEM 10.4:

Yeas: Commissioners Flaherty-Merritt and Morales - 2

Nays: Commissioners D'Angelo, Harvey, O'Leary, Stango, Sweeney, Theriault, White, and President Hayes - 8

CLERK: Two to eight, motion fails.

President Hayes assumed the Chair at this time.

11. COMMITTEE ON SCHOOL PERSONNEL

11.1 Upon a motion by Commissioner Harvey and duly seconded by Commissioner Stango, it was voted unanimously to approve the appointment of Dana Manning as the Supervisor of Fine Arts for Waterbury Arts Magnet School.

HAYES: Motion is made and seconded. Any discussion? Hearing none – all in favor, opposed. Congratulations.

12. SUPERINTENDENT'S NOTIFICATION TO THE BOARD

Upon a motion by Commissioner D'Angelo and duly seconded by Commissioner White, it was voted, with Commissioners D'Angelo and Theriault "abstaining, to receive and place on file items 12.1 through 12.15, Superintendent's Notification to the Board, as listed:

12.1 Athletic appointments effective immediately:

Bao, Jaime – Soccer Coach, NEMS.

Gronda, Stephanie – Head Cheerleading Coach, WHS.

12.2 Athletic resignations effective immediately:

Caouette, Crystal – Assistant Cheerleading Coach, CHS.

Fazzino, Francisca – Soccer Coach, NEMS.

Perriello, Rebecca – Varsity Cheerleading Coach, CHS.

Veronneau, Michael – Assistant Football Coach, CHS.

Wanzie, Dennis – Assistant Football Coach, CHS.

12.3 Appointments:

Calabrese, Matthew – SVP, Chase School, effective September 27, 2010.

Forman, Paula – Middle School Athletic Director, effective immediately.

12.4 Grant funded appointments/stipends, effective immediately:

Henry, Robin – Administrative Oversight of Family Resource Center, \$2,500 annual stipend.

Kerwin, Colleen – Elementary Instructional Tutor, Kingsbury School, maximum of 18 hours per week, 10 months per year @ \$30.00 per hour, no benefits.
Thompson, Philip – ARRA Professional Development Coordinator, 19 hours per week, 12 months per year, \$19.81 per hour, no benefits.
Vaichus, Susan – Title I Instructional Tutor, Non-public High Schools, maximum of 18 hours per week, \$30.00 per hour, no benefits.

12.5 NEMS STEM After School Program appointments, Monday through Thursday, 2 ½ hours per day/10 hours per week at appropriate union rate, effective October 18, 2010 through April 15, 2011:

Program Administrator: Michael LoRusso

Data Clerk: Roberta Santamaria

Teachers: Grace Halloran, Miriam Wilson, Yvonne de la Vega,
David Habersang, Charles Vaughan

Paraprofessionals: Leslie DePaulo, Carole Maloney, Robin Andrikis, Nydia Solla

12.6 Enlightenment School After-school program appointments, three hours per week, salary according to individual's contract, effective immediately:

Crosby, Sharon – Paraprofessional

Davis, Pam – Counselor

12.7 21st Century Community Learning Center 2010/2011 Program Appointments:

Cohort 5/Wallace Middle School

Hansen, Laura

Paulsen, Carrie-Ann

Stevens, Robert (substitute)

Cohort 7/Project #1 – Wilson School

Fengler, Kelly (replacing Andrea Perrelli)

Perrelli, Andrea (substitute)

12.8 WAMS After School Program appointments, salary according to individual's contract, effective immediately:

Andrew Caruk, 3 hrs/wk

Phillip Sterling, 5 hrs/wk

Marianne Vagnini, 3 hrs/wk

Licia Fitzpatrick, 3 hrs/wk

Holly Maxson, 3 hrs/wk

Joann D'Angelo, 3 hrs/wk

William LaVallee, 3 hrs/wk

Michelle LeBlanc, 3 hrs/wk

Ana Bosman, 3 hrs/wk

Scott Serafine, 6 hrs/wk

12.9 After-school Detention Program appointments:

NEMS - Jim Hurdle, Lisa Mason

WMS – Donna Bryk, Jennifer Magnavice

WSMS – Anne Bellfoire, Lori Ditillo

CHS – Judith Brophy, Nikoleta Kollchaku

KHS – Larry Feola, Leann Lizak

WHS – Carmella DeStefano, Lynne Palleria

12.10 TPTA Appointments effective October 5, 2010 to December 2, 2010, salary according to individual's contract:

Barnard

Teachers: Christine Johnston
Janeen Washington

Subs: Melissa Steck
Maureen Giuffre
Jane Natoli

Brooklyn

Teachers: Susan Field
Nancy McCulloch

Subs: Donna Barbati

Bucks Hill

Teachers: Francine Ouellette (Lead Teacher)
Megan Budd
Doreen Lawson
SueAnn Armour

Annette Skubisz
Georgann Butterfield

Bunker Hill

Teachers: Brenda Toma (Lead Teacher)
Carmen Gadea-Concepcion
Margaret Jasiulevicious
Donna Lyons

Susan Groppi
Michael Labagh

Carrington

Teachers: Claudia Biello
Marlene Madera
Jamie (Alvo) Miller

Mary Helen Levine
Marilyn Bartkus
Melissa Boutote

Chase

Teachers: Steve Matthews (bussing also)
Ron Defazio
Elizabeth Sheehy
Amanda Campagna
MaryAnn Perugini
Matthew Wallace

Sub: Lauren Argenta

W. Cross

Teachers: Michelle Cervero
Amanda Gilligan
Evelyn Mendoza
Marnee Capobianco
Linda McGill

Subs: Elizabeth Marshall
Andrea Portanova
Michelle Gasparri

Driggs

Teachers: Karen Griffin
Justine Kuncas
Jessica Sconziano
Cindy Albizu
Lynn Green
Lucy Sheetz

Subs: Zita Blake
Michael Decarlo
Alicia Vargas

Generali

Teachers: Lenore Gagain (Lead Teacher)
Amy Neibel
Orphine Barrett
Timothy Coughlin
Rebecca Harrison
Christina Piccochi

Subs: Jennifer Dwyer
Nikki Barbieri
Amy Manning
Stefanie Dyer
Danielle Fortier

Gilmartin

Teachers: Lisa Marie Klem
Lorraine Trudeau
Teresa Morais
Shernett Evans-Foster

Subs: Jeanette Tapper
Diane Quatrano
Thea Ricci
Kristine Kijak

Hopeville

Teachers: Margaret Perugini Subs: Christine Diorio
Mark Esposito Rachelle Bette
Kelly Brooks Martha Labbe
Michelle Callahan Richard Smith
Administrator: Maria Moulthrop

Kingsbury

Teachers: Bret Bisailon Subs: David Greene
Anna Machial Arcaro Eric Feeney
Kari Knightly Lee DiBella
Anthony Ciuffo Kathleen Ferrucci

Regan

Teachers: Amy Petruzzi (Lead Teacher) Subs: Karen Angurio
Lindsey O'Brien

Sprague

Teachers: Timothy Giammatteo Melissa Graboski Sally Olson

Tinker

Teachers: Janet Sagendorf (Lead Teacher) Toni Ames
Jaime Larson Cathy Mastrianna
Debbie Ponte Nancy White

Walsh

Teachers: Melissa Howles Subs: Ana Paris
Nicolle Scarzella

Washington

Teachers: Melissa Lohr Melissa Calabrese

Wilson

Teachers: Kristen Boehm Subs: Kathleen Fraser
Marge DeSisto Antionetta Paolino
Krista Zaccagnini Mariann Sullivan
Matt Cocuzzi Chrissy Rydinsward
Cheryl Labagh
Robin Henry

12.11 Wilson FRC's "Homework and Hip Hop" Program appointments:

Monday/Wednesday (Grade 1):

Jessica Reho – 21 Days/42 Hours @ \$19.23 p/hr.
Alba Reveron – 21 Days/42 Hours @ \$15.00 p/hr.
Jenny Giron – 21 Days/42 Hours at \$15.95 p/hr.
Tanya Tenor – 21 Days/42 Hours @ \$30.00 p/hr.

Tuesday/Thursday (Grade 2):

Jessica Reho – 19 Days/38 Hours @ \$19.23 p/hr.
Alba Reveron – 19 Days/38 Hours @ \$15.00 p/hr.
Jenny Giron – 19 Days/38 Hours @ \$15.95 p/hr.
Leocadia Quinones – 19 Days/38 Hours @ \$30.00 p/hr.

Subs:

Melissa Desjardins – M, W, Th \$30.00 p/hr.
Betzaida Vega – T, Th \$30.00 p/hr.
Kristyn Mastropietro – M, T, W, Th \$30.00 p/hr.
Nina Quesnel – M, W \$30.00 p/hr.

12.12 Teacher new hires:

NAME	SCHOOL	POSITION	STEP		EFFECTIVE
Aibinder, Andrew	WHS	Math	MA	1	08/25/10
Fiore, Anne	District-wide	TESOL	MA+15	3	09/14/10
Ieronimo, Karen	Driggs	Grade 1	MA	1	09/22/10
Mills, Monica	WHS	Math	BA	1	08/31/10
Reinold, Andrew	WAMS	Science	MA+15	1	09/20/10

12.13 Teacher transfers:

Robalino, Alexandra – from Chase Bilingual K to Chase Bilingual Grade 2 (due to elimination of kindergarten class), effective 9/2/10.

Villar, Yenny – from Chase Bilingual Grade 2 to Hopeville Bilingual Grade 5, effective 09/02/10.

12.14 Terminations:

Samela, Joseph – WSMS Technology Education Teacher, effective 9/17/10.

12.15 Resignations:

LoRusso, Janet – Library Technical Asst., Maloney Magnet School, eff. 11/10/10.

Lucarelli, Jodi – Title I Reading Teacher, Driggs School, effective 10/03/10.

Petterson, Marjorie – Librarian, Sprague School, effective 09/17/10.

Sylvester, David – Middle School Athletic Director, effective 9/21/10.

HAYES: Motion is made and seconded. All in favor, opposed. Do we have any unfinished business from the preceding meeting only? Okay, so we have no unfinished business from the preceding meeting. Alright, under other unfinished, new or miscellaneous business – Commissioner Theriault.

Commissioner D'Angelo left at 9:25 p.m.

THERIAULT: I have to apologize to you President Hayes, I really should have eliminated 8.1 from the Consent Calendar but having had the window of opportunity pass, I didn't want to vote for 8.1 so, consequently it put me in the agenda of having to vote down all of those items and I'm not necessarily opposed to all of those items. But speaking specifically to the School Inspector's Office Reorganization Plan, I think that the Board really needs to understand that this debacle, this terrible situation with regard to our maintenance and custodial staff, has caused us to be an embarrassment, not only in this City but throughout the State. For us to have supervisors that aren't supervising the people that we have and having them have the ability to work someplace else on overtime while they're collecting overtime, to have us pay \$10,000 for a window that's not a window, that's only one piece of glass that should have been two pieces of glass that should have been replaced that wasn't replaced that was inspected four times. To have people carrying on, borrowing tools, stealing tools, stealing equipment right from underneath our nose, and I say it hasn't just happened in the last couple of years, it's been going on for years and years. And then we get to the debacle about the Christmas party that was gonna be held using the scrap metal and my suggestion, of course, every Board member bring in your scrap metal, especially your copper pipe, and we'll have our own Christmas party, just shameful, absolutely shameful. So in the past four months, we have John Cross and George D'Agostino and let me qualify, George is a great guy, okay, my comment about him, I apologize to him,

no disparaging remarks, but he doesn't know very much about maintenance. He's a great guy, he's a great Principal and a great around human being, and I apologize if I said anything discourteous about him. John Cross has a ton of experience. So now this last fiasco we paid, and I do have to mention some people here, our School Inspector number one, and our School Inspector number two, you know we paid them "x" amount of dollars, approximately over \$60,000 while they were on paid administrative leave. And then, of course, we paid John Cross and Mr. D'Agostino "x" amount of dollars and the difference between all of that had none of this taken place, it's cost us \$100,000 so far. A hundred thousand dollars to fix nepotism, cronyism, favoritism, and opportunity to take care of your friends in the good ole boy network. Absolutely disgraceful. But you see Commissioner Stango and I, I won't put words in your mouth, I'll just speak for myself, while I was in the system this whole thing was going on constantly, the good ole boy network, constantly, couldn't get anything done in our schools, you had to beg to get anything done. So now all of a sudden we're gonna go out, we're gonna privatize this, we're gonna privatize the number one job, the number two job, and the guy that was in the number two job, we're gonna make a number three job for him at a cost of about \$125,000 including his salary and benefits. Now we're gonna take these two other jobs that we had and we're gonna privatize them to the tune of I would say, and I'm just establishing a guesstimate here, to the tune of about \$275,000 including finder's fee, administrative fees, and all the other fees that are gonna be associated with privatizing these two jobs. I have no problem with finalizing and privatizing the number one job, absolutely no problem with it all, I'm just marveled at how quickly it was able to be done. Did the Civil Service Commission check out on this, as it's required, because it is a Civil Service job? You know, did our human relations guy, I know he checked in on it, and I know the human relations guy at Civil Service checked in on it, but he is not the Civil Service Commission, he works for the Civil Service Commission or the City, this is a Civil Service job, so the Civil Service Commission has to say "okay" and give us the blessing. I never saw anything go through so quickly like grease lightening, unbelievable how it happened. But I'm not opposed to the one job being privatized, but I certainly am opposed to the two jobs being privatized. I think that the number two gentleman should be brought back, continue on with his duties, we found absolutely no wrong doing other than some minor misjudgments, but absolutely found nothing the matter with his performance with the exception of him saying things and then his people turned on him trying to make up things about him, which were minor things by comparison to the enormity of the problems that we have faced in the past year or two. Now it's always Waterbury's way, you know when you don't like what the messenger has to say, you kill the messenger but in this case the message went on, and the message came onto this Board, and many of you, I hope you took the opportunity to take some of those videotapes that I carefully copied for you, so you can see the dilapidated delirious conditions that our schools were in. In fact, one Commissioner said to me "I couldn't watch it, it was too painful". Geese, take it out and watch it again. Painful, how painful is it for the kids and the teachers and the administrators? We sent a school administrator packing that has allowed 25 years of neglect and despair in this town. Painful, how about the people that have been subject to these delirious conditions for 25 years? Absolutely shameful. So I'm not opposed to privatizing the number one job. But if you're gonna private number one and two job you're gonna be looking at somewhere between, just to guesstimate again, about 175 to 200 thousand dollars. But we just told the teachers, or we didn't tell them no, we told them maybe. But we can take 100 thousand, 200 thousand dollars and spend it like money's growing on trees. Commissioner D'Angelo and myself have

methodically gone around to these schools and taken a lot of heat for some of the investigations that we've looked at. I, personally, have gotten pats on the back and kicks in the backside for some of the things that I've said, but I'm glad I had the ability to say them and I'm glad I had the ability to have George D'Agostino and John Cross diligently going around these buildings and methodically going after every single area and I supplied them with nearly 21 hours of video of our schools in disrepair and they have carefully gone around and they have addressed many of the problems that they have seen. So I congratulate both of them, and once again I apologize to Mr. D'Agostino, no disrespect meant. But my point is you know with \$100,000 that we already spent and then \$175,000 that we're gonna spend just this year into fixing the problem; we're into almost a quarter of a million dollars for things people are supposed to do. A School Inspector means inspector of the schools, it doesn't mean taking care of the good ole boy network and that's exactly what happened here. And I'm sick and tired of it. You voted for it, I'm sorry I didn't get in a little sooner to give my fire and brimstone speech before you voted, but I know it's a motion that has passed and so forth, but I just couldn't let this night pass without having something to say about these terrible conditions that have occurred and I have summarily asked that our School Inspector, because of the conditions that I found, I have asked at least 15 times to the Clerk of the Board that he be fired. And I understand the Board's reluctance to do that because it would be a big deal with regard to legal fees and everything else but you know I think business is gonna change when we have guy that's not part of the good ole network and a guy that comes in and he's a private entity and he's accountable and we're gonna have a contract with him, probably not forever, I don't know how long the contract will go, but you know if Joe Jones doesn't do a good job for us in two years, then we're gonna get Joe Smith. If Joe Smith doesn't do a good job, then we'll get somebody else. But you see then there's accountability here. And no disrespect to any of the fine custodians and fine maintenance people we have and we have plenty of them that do a good job. Look at this place – clean, immaculate. I went to the North End the other day; you could eat off the floor, clean, immaculate. And I think many of our schools are coming along but we have a long way to go. So you want to spend the money, know what you're spending, know how you're spending it, and know what you're spending it for, you're spending it for, to make people do something that they already should have been doing. Thank you very much for your kind attention.

HAYES: Anyone else have anything under unfinished?

O'LEARY: You know for the last 14 months I have heard a lot of criticism from the taxpayers of the City of Waterbury how this Board conducts business. And I have, for the most part, diligently stuck up for this Board. But I'll tell you one thing, I think that what happened here tonight was a disgrace, I think that this was, we earned the criticism that we're gonna get and you know, I'll talk about the bonus. First of all, I'll start out by saying the teachers, very incorrectly, point out that the police officers got their raises. They've been in arbitration for 14 months, 14 months. That's number one. Number two, these abstentions, let's not sugarcoat them, they're yes votes, because if you weren't going to vote "yes", you could vote "no", because you're not giving anything away. So Commissioner Flaherty-Merritt, Commissioner D'Angelo, and Commissioner Theriault, sugarcoated their positions very cutely which will earn them the criticism that they deserve. Lastly, the compromise was wrong, we should have voted on the 2.5, that's what was presented to us. It was the union's job to counter later on if they wanted to. But to come up and say I thought about this for a week, Commissioner Sweeney, a

week and not mention it to anybody else and then bring it up here in front of 400 people tonight I thought was very, very wrong and I'm very surprised. So I won't be defending this Board's actions tomorrow or the next day because, quite frankly, I think we really disappointed the taxpayers of the City of Waterbury here tonight. And quite frankly I'm amazed to be a part of it. Thank you.

Commissioner O'Leary left at 9:35 p.m.

HAYES: I'll just echo what Commissioner O'Leary stated, I was really disappointed the way that whole thing went down tonight. We have to make a lot of tough decisions, sometimes you have to look people in the eye, as they ask us to do, and tell them what we can or can't do. Anything else...

THERIAULT: Just a point of clarification, President Hayes, I would like, through you as the Chair of the Board, to get a clarification with regard to this matter and contractual matters, with regard to those of us that have either spouses, siblings, children, in the school system with regard to these things. This thing seemed to be very crucial, you know, and one way or another, depending upon which way one of us voted, could be the crucial vote. So I generally abstain on the side of caution, with all due respect, not to sugarcoat, not to get out of the vote, but I delineated my argument quite succinctly, not . . ., but quite clearly in terms of prior to the vote. But I certainly wasn't trying to escape and sugarcoat my vote but rather to abstain myself from a conflict of interest which the newspaper would throw right back in my face immediately, and I don't blame them. So I'd like a clarification, a request from the Board to the Corporation Counsel with regard to whether or not we can participate or not with regard to contracts and a bonus or a step or anything else that has to do with monetary increases for members of our family. Thank you.

HAYES: I tend to agree with what Commission O'Leary had stated that I think you need to abstain when it's something that's gonna benefit your family or relatives. But quite honestly though I think there's only three or four of us that don't have a relative working in the school system as teachers. So we're all going to recuse ourselves from it? I mean some have chosen to do it, some have not. So I think it's important that...

THERIAULT: I think that's the clarification I'm looking for.

HAYES: It's important that we get that clarification.

FLAHERTY-MERRITT: I'd like to echo the same thing, I'd like that clarification because I wanted to recuse myself and that's why I prefaced it with I was part of a negotiating team but it wasn't an individual vote, it was a consensus of a group of individuals, which is different from the jurisdiction of this Board and that's where I felt that difference was and I really didn't feel comfortable knowing that my vote could sway either way for an immediate relative when we have policies in place for nepotism and to me that would violate our nepotism policy.

HAYES: We'll get a clarification. I think for years we've had Board members who have had teachers in the family. My initial response is, if they're not living with you and you're not benefiting any from that into your household income or, whatever, that would allow you to make a decision on that. Because like I said, if everyone who has a teacher in

the family that's on this Board had to reclude himself, there wouldn't be a lot of votes being taken by those members.

THERIAULT: Through the Chair, I think that's exactly my point. I mean if they're not living with you but they're still your children, would you have a temptation to vote on their side because you see their point of view, you know. And I think that's, I think the point of them living with you is not necessarily the caveat, I think the point of them being related to you and, maybe you aren't benefiting but they are a part of your family and they are benefiting. And your vote, casting an affirmative vote for their side, makes them benefit. So I'm not saying that you're benefiting directly but, you know, you're just not supposed to do it. I think we're splitting hairs here whether or not, one's saying yea, you're benefiting, the other's saying no, you're not benefiting if they don't live with you. And with all due respect, I respect your judgment on that, President Hayes, but I think we really need a legal opinion; it really needs to become part of the record in terms of our policies and procedures.

HAYES: I do believe we got something from the Corporation Counsel because I asked that question when it came to the contract. Paul, do you want to shed some light on this?

GUIDONE: . . . specifically related to who could participate in the negotiations, bargaining. I would say two things – one is Corporation Counsel has made it clear it won't issue an opinion unless it's an opinion requested by the Board, full Board. And two, I have to tell you, this is what I heard, if it's a very broad subject, Corporation Counsel's gonna want (*tape ended*) . . . the Board act on it so what Corporation Counsel gets is a specific question that we're asking an opinion on. I can tell right now this one could be all over the lot.

D'ANGELO: We have different levels of relatives and all...

GUIDONE: I think we ought to try to frame something up for Board action requesting an opinion of that type and try to be concise and if the Board wants to add or subtract items from that language, they can do so when it takes an action, that way we're clear on what we're asking, the Board's clear on what it's asking.

WHITE: There was something many years ago stated by the Board of Ethics and also I believe in our ethics rules, that if you are not benefiting from it monetarily that you can vote on it.

GUIDONE: We can research what exists already.

HAYES: Why don't we do that first and once we have that information in front of us, we can see whether or not we need to go further. Because, again, I don't quite understand how, because I asked the question before I appointed people to the, and Commissioner Theriault is one I appoint, Commissioner Flaherty-Merritt, Corporation Counsel said it's okay for them to negotiate a contract. So if they're able to negotiate a contract, I don't know why they can't vote on some of these other issues. If we can get what we have on record first to everybody then we can have a discussion on whether or not we want to frame a particular question for Corporation Counsel. Commissioner Stango.

STANGO: President Hayes, I'm a little disturbed with the fact that you and Commissioner O'Leary said "disappointed" about what happened tonight. I mean did anyone sit at that Workshop last week and did not think we were going down a long tunnel that was gonna end up who knows where here tonight? We were coming into this deal knowing that there was going to be 400 to 500 teachers here and that they wanted what they wanted and you told them right there at the Workshop that you were definitely against it. I mean it was doomed to failure from the beginning. I think, don't you think that perhaps if this had been, last week say, let me refer this to Finance then we would have escaped this and maybe that's when Commissioner Sweeney's plan of reducing it to 1.5, or whatever, would have been put on the table at that point, and we would have avoided that. Commissioner Sweeney, and anyone else here, was just trying to make this deal more palatable so that we can handle this resolution in a more calm manner. I personally think it should have gone to, I mean it's put off now for another Workshop, it could have been put off last week and we would not have gone through the angst that we went through tonight.

HAYES: Just in response to that Commissioner Stango, they asked us. When I was contacted by Donna, I said I don't think it's a good idea but they asked us for the 2.5%, that's what we were voting on. If we voted "no" tonight and you wanted to consider other things, we could have done that. It just seems like we don't want to take a stand on that particular issue. They asked us, they brought everybody here, as she was quoted in the newspaper "I want to see the look in the eye". We looked them in the eye, we said the people of Waterbury can't afford to use these monies and then leave us short for the subsequent years. I think it was a simple answer. Now if they wanted to then come back to us and say what about a 1.5 or if we wanted to offer something, then we could have an opportunity to look at the numbers and see what they might be. But we're still looking at a 3.7 million dollar debt that we have next year. And I don't know putting it off another week or another two weeks, I thought it was best to put it to a vote so that we don't have this thing stirring up in the system and having people all riled up . . . be honest with them and give a quick response but we decided now to modify it, we're gonna go forward, and all that stuff. So we'll have that discussion next week.

STANGO: Just to finish up my point, and people tend to call the WTA on that email which I didn't even see, I heard about it tonight, but people have to understand that that's what unions do, unions rally their troops and that was a letter, I didn't see it, to rally their troops. This is what they do, if they didn't do it, they would be voted out, there would be a new representative union in here. So you can't take too much offense to that, this is how they talk.

HAYES: I didn't take offense to it; I gave it the due respect. They asked me to give an answer, I gave an answer. Everybody else seems like they want to be afraid to give them an answer. We know that we can't afford it but we're gonna dance around it for a little while. I mean we're gonna go forward with it, I thought we were just being honest and telling them that we didn't have those dollars, and I still don't know where to get them – 1.5%. You know, again, I was one of the ones who voted to approve the grant funded employees and find the same people who voted "no" to some people making 11 or 12 dollars an hour now want to pander to the teachers and give them 1.5% bonuses; let's just find the money somewhere. That 1.5 is still gonna represent close to two million dollars and we know we're gonna have a shortfall of 3.7 next year. So we'll have

that discussion at the Workshop with the merits of what we're gonna be putting forward. Commissioner Harvey.

HARVEY: I just want to weigh in on this, as well. I don't know, I guess we have a difference of opinion here, President Hayes, because I think all of this could have been avoided had we talked. We had two differences of opinion for the use of the money, didn't know about it until the last Workshop. Commissioner Sweeney, I've been thinking about it all week as well and you know, President Hayes, you call it negotiating, I don't, I call it talking. And the teachers have come before us, in number, twice, we still haven't talked. We still have not talked. It's not negotiating. We're gonna have, we said in the same breath "no, I don't think we can afford it" which I agree, but in the same breath we said "we really need to open the communications" and we haven't done that. We sent them home and we really don't know, we're gonna talk about it next week but I still say we need to open up communications here because the leadership, they're doing their job by rallying the troops. I grew up in a union household; my mother was a union steward for ten-plus years, I know what was said to get them here but we still have not addressed the issue of communicating. And I don't know what we're afraid of, I think there's fear here in doing that. I don't think the fear is in the vote, I'd like to vote more, I can't vote on something I really don't know about. But what I'm hearing them say is I believe that they're aware if we give this 1.5 that next year if there are no funds that means layoffs. And that's what the fear is, I think, here on this Board, we don't want to do that but we're going to have to make the hard decisions, the hard decisions are if they want the bonus, I hate to call it that because, I'm thinking of taxpayers, but if that's what they want then they must understand the consequence of that. The consequence is their neighbor's job or their job, that's the consequence, and that's what I think we fear.

HAYES: But there's a further consequence. If we lay off teachers we're gonna have oversized classrooms, we're gonna have, we're not gonna have enough teachers to teach the kids that we have. So regardless of whether we have money or don't have money, if their leadership, who are mostly senior people who have already gotten the three and a half percent this year, the layoffs are gonna come from the younger people who make less money which means we lay off more of them because they make less money. Not only will the taxpayers have to pay a price for this but our students. We always talk about we're advocates for our kids, if in fact we have to do layoffs because we want to pander to them and give them a little bit less than one an half, or whatever, to make them happy and for their moral, we're gonna be hurting students, we're gonna be hurting kids in the classroom. We'll have oversized classrooms again. We can't do that. We'll have that discussion but like I said, I think we got to look at the bigger picture here. I think it's pretty clear, we've been lucky, they've been lucky that we haven't had to lay off people, that we've been able to keep our class sizes in a manageable position. If we lay out this money, we don't even know if we can meet the 3.7 million next year. If we put some of that money aside so it can help us with that, we're preventing our kids from having larger classrooms, we're working hard to come up with some new ideas, and quite honestly, a lot of the younger teachers that are coming out of school with some of these ideas, we'd lose those people and I can't support that.

HARVEY: Why don't we have that discussion with the union, Pat? You're preaching to the choir here.

HAYES: We don't have to have a discussion.

HARVEY: Well that's what we need to do, we need to have that.

HAYES: It's a bad idea. We can have that discussion all we want, it's a bad idea. It's the union leadership wanting to come here and try to make us look bad but you know what, I've been a union guy...

HARVEY: They did.

HAYES: No, they didn't make us look bad, you know what, I think they made themselves look bad, unfortunately. That's why I said it was unfortunate they came in front of us because we've got people sitting at home that don't know where their next dollar is coming from, don't know whether they can pay their rent that month, and we got people here saying just give us an extra two and a half million dollars. Give us two and a half million dollars and we don't care next year when we're obligated as a result of a collective bargaining agreement that went through the State Board of Mediation/Arbitration, which something that both sides benefit from and sometimes both sides don't appreciate the ultimate decision. We've got an obligation to come up with 3.7 million dollars more next year, where are we getting that from? You know I don't believe it's coming from the State, at least we got this money from the Federal government but even that, a couple years from now that money stops coming and this economy doesn't turn around, the stimulus money is supposed to make so that at some point we're gonna reach a point where we can support ourselves. I don't see that coming in a couple years, so even that we could be looking at layoffs three or four more years down the road with using that money. I'm willing to have that discussion but, like I said, they came in front of us; they got what they wanted tonight. We should have been honest and just tell them we don't have the money. I do feel there's a lot of people out there that work for us, that understand that, that appreciate what the taxpayers provide for them. Sometimes, you know there's 200 people in the room but there are a lot of others at home and sometimes that's where the real voices are and they appreciate the fact that they are working with us, they're working for us, they're working for our students and they understand that in fact, even though a lot of them don't live in town, that the taxpayers of Waterbury support them. We have to look at the students and the taxpayers and honor our commitment that we obliged to as a result of the State Board of Mediation/Arbitration. Commissioner Theriault.

THERIAULT: Just so my remarks are not misinterpreted as sugarcoating, President Hayes, I'm in the same book as you and we're on the same page and you're 1000% right on everything that you said; I agree with absolutely everything that you just said. And furthermore, sometimes you're better off with the devil you know versus the devil that you don't know. As I said in my little soliloquy before, sometimes, a little Shakespeare there, you know, every once in a while it rubs off. But that being said, as I said before, what do you want to do, do you want to get the bonuses and then next year you want to be laying off your brethren? You want to be cutting programs, programs that affect kids, programs that affect your fellow colleagues because you think you should get, you think you're entitled to that bonus? Personally, I think they should be looking for a step but we can't perpetuate that step year after year after year and they know that. So they're kind of fudging on the bet a little bit saying okay, we won't call it a step, we'll call it a bonus. You know, but with all due respect to Commissioner O'Leary,

who I like and respect, you know he did kind of give Commissioner Flaherty-Merritt, and myself, D'Angelo, he did kind of give us all a black eye. So as we come back in the next meeting with a nice juicy steak on our black eye, I look forward to the opportunity of voicing my opinion. I never sugarcoat anything, I vote my conscience. And if you want to see me vote, I'll vote, but I won't vote with a conflict of interest or anytime I perceive that I have a conflict of interest, especially when a fellow Board member is recusing themselves because they perceive a conflict of interest. So I kind of take my lead from other Board of Ed members and I do resent the fact that you know another Commissioner would say I'm sugarcoating my vote and I'm looking for a way out. I never look for a way out. There's no way out but the honest way, so I don't like the sugarcoated message but I still like and respect Commissioner O'Leary very much.

HAYES: Commissioner Morales and then Commissioner Sweeney.

MORALES: I believe there's so much confusion and we should open up the lines of communication because they believe that we start getting problems with the budget next year or two years they will not get laid off. That's what they believe. If we give them the money that's what they believe. And I think we should communicate with them to make them understand that if something happens, they're going to get laid off and we don't want to do that, we're not here to do that. They have to understand what's going on. You know just not giving them the money and next year we start having problems . . . laid off and we're gonna have a lot of teachers here saying that they do not want to get laid off and I told them about it, I told them that yes, you have a lot of people here, okay, next year we give them . . . a lot more here that do not want to go through the same thing. We have to explain to them what's going on.

HAYES: With all due respect, that's exactly what I did; I explained it clearly to them. We explained it at the Workshop. They wanted to push this forward, they wanted to have this public confrontation and we blinked. Anyone on that particular issue? Dr. Snead, you don't want to weigh in on this, really, do you?

SUPERINTENDENT: I gotta throw a monkey wrench in there. I just saw Representative Larry Butler there and Representative Aldarondo a few minutes ago and I just thought it might be helpful to have a conversation, I think I already know what the answer is but you know to have some conversations with our State reps and find out what their prediction on the ECS next year. Like I said, I think I know what the answer is but it would be helpful to get some insight from them.

HAYES: The fact of the matter is everybody's up for election right now. I don't know if anybody can predict anything until maybe after November and then they can let us know what they think is gonna happen. A lot of things can change – we got wrestling divas and all this kind of stuff out there, we don't know how people are gonna vote. So I think, with all due respect, to ask them what money we're gonna get next year, I don't think they can give us an honest answer. Maybe after November we can talk to the people who are left standing, hopefully all of our delegation will be there and we can, I didn't want that to be a political statement, as an appreciation to all of our representatives that we currently have, they do a good job for us. Okay, under new business, Commissioner Sweeney's, got something I know.

SWEENEY: I'm really sorry I caused such a level of turmoil tonight and I am terribly heartbroken that Commissioner O'Leary isn't here for what I'm gonna present.

THERIAULT: I got another steak if you need one.

SWEENEY: I probably need two and one for my fanny about now. But I wanted to get back and push forward with this idea of the New Haven reform. What I'm asking for, President Hayes, is I would sincerely like about 40 minutes to an hour on the next Workshop because I think that's the time this deserves.

HAYES: What's our next Workshop Agenda look like? We keep pushing stuff back. Do we really need to do it at our next Workshop?

SWEENEY: We need to get it going.

GUIDONE: We have CAPT and the high school principals put off, middle school accelerated academy report, and health clinic report put off from the last one to this one and now we have...

HAYES: Actually, I'm also looking for a monthly report from the Superintendent with regard to what's going on with the changes. We asked for monthly report, there was supposed to be a monthly meeting to keep track of the changes that we've made with regard to trying to improve test scores and we asked for that on a monthly basis. I know he said he's meeting with his cabinet on a monthly basis, so I was expecting to have that at our next meeting, as well. I thought that could be part of the CAPT thing already. Could we wait till the next Workshop, we do have this charter school thing going on Wednesday night, too.

SWEENEY: And that was one of the reasons that I, that my original planned request was to ask that we do it on a night on its own because I think sincerely that it deserves that, a night of its own. But I hate to do that given the fact that we have the charter school one week, we have our Board Self Evaluation another week, we have a holiday in where we're moving our Monday meeting to Tuesday. You know we just seem to be so crammed and yet you know this is something that really needs to get going cause this not going to come together in a month, two months, or even six months, this needs a year.

HAYES: Who do we need to invite to that though, do we need to get WTA...

SWEENEY: We need to do some work ourselves, that's my feeling at this point in time, and I'll ask Carrie if she would just pass these that way, but this is just two pages of the work that New Haven has already done and I think it's the basis for the work that we would need to do to do something similar. And New Haven has done a lot of the work but New Haven has done the work for New Haven and anything that we do, needs to speak to Waterbury, it needs to be Waterbury's issues, it needs to be Waterbury's solutions and I think that's the piece that we need to sit down and we need to look at exactly what school reform, district reform looks like to us, what we want it to be, and then we need to talk about how we want to get there. And I think at that point in time is when you decide to start bringing in the other stakeholders which are our SAW, our WTA, our parents, our supervisors, our teachers, that's the time to bring them forward.

But I think that this is the first piece of the work that has to be done. And again, this is only the first two pages of a very lengthy process that New Haven did. But it asks the right questions and gives cause for you to think.

HAYES: I'm not really sure who we need to have involved in the discussion or how much time we're gonna need for the discussion. Do we want to get Attorney Dugas to come in, the representative this presentation was made for or would it be CABE?

SWEENEY: This was a CABE presentation, it was a workshop they have run several times now and each time it has come across my email I have forwarded it to the rest of the Board again so that others could participate. I do know Commissioner Theriault recently took part in the last one at ACES.

HAYES: Is everybody prepared to have thoughtful discussion on this?

WHITE: Do you think we should wait until after we have the discussion on the charter school?

HAYES: Well that's this week.

WHITE: We have so many initiatives going; I think it's a good...

HAYES: Another thing, we have a conflict with our self-evaluation on the 20th. While we tried to accommodate the Policy and Prevention Board, which I think we should be going to because they've asked us and actually we're gonna be receiving an award which might be a good thing, but Mr. Radar doesn't think we should push him back to 7:00 so we're gonna have to reschedule that. So that's a whole other thing. I think it's important for us to go to that Policy Prevention Board. Carrie's gonna get more dates from him and try to reschedule that so we can give it our full attention. Do you want to do it like put a half hour on our Workshop and then decide like we did on the charter schools if we want to go forward and set up a separate for further discussion? I don't know if there's a half hour discussion though, so I don't even know if we need that.

SWEENEY: I think you need a whole lot more than that.

STANGO: How long is the charter going to take Wednesday night?

HAYES: We'd have to post that as an additional item to discuss? If we were to add this particular item to the Wednesday Workshop, I guess we could still do that now.

GUIDONE: You could if you wanted to. I wouldn't be surprised to expect the charter discussion to continue off of the special meeting onto the Workshop if there's gonna be any action you're gonna have to take at the following meeting, it's very possible that charter would also be on the Workshop Agenda coming off of the special meeting.

HAYES: That's what Mary meant, we're meeting on Wednesday with the expectation that somebody is gonna be putting something forward for our action or discussion at a workshop for action at the subsequent meeting because of the deadline of the end of the month.

WHITE: I think we could introduce it at the meeting. We could introduce it, make sure people read it, do you know, just handing it out now, some might forget about it. Two people aren't here, they don't know about it. So if we...

HAYES: Could we just hold off through this next Workshop?

SWEENEY: I think we need to decide for ourselves just how imperative and important it is that we do something with this district because it needs help. This district needs help, our students need help, our staff needs help, this district needs help. And sooner or later we have to say that this, something has to be a priority and I think we need to look at this and decide if we need to make it a priority. At least that much. If you want to put it on the next workshop and give it 20 minutes or whatever you can give it, let's at least get the conversation started.

HAYES: Okay, we'll do that.

GUIDONE: Why don't we place it on and see how the evening goes and then we can make judgments of what, if anything, we need to move.

HAYES: We just want to make sure that when we get to it that we give it sufficient time to determine whether or not we want to give...

WHITE: I'd put it on for the next two workshops because one workshop is not going to be enough.

HARVEY: I agree.

SWEENEY: It's gonna be a continuing workshop, let me tell you, it's gonna be on every workshop at some point.

HAYES: We're gonna have workshops with reports from the Superintendent and Assistant Superintendents and our Supervisors of content and instruction as how things are going, as well. So we're gonna have a lot of things on our agenda.

HARVEY: Commissioner Sweeney, is this, I mean we have an Ad-hoc Committee on Achievement Gap, is this something that falls under that umbrella.

SWEENEY: Quite frankly it hasn't met. The urgency is here...

HARVEY: And the two people, the co-chairs, are not here.

SWEENEY: And this information has gone out to both these people.

HARVEY: Okay, then move forward with the workshop because we shouldn't delay this.

SWEENEY: And again, you know, I considered the thought of a committee to handle this but it doesn't seem appropriate, this is too big and too large and this Board needs to take the first step. Beyond that, it will be working committees and sub-committees

similar to what we did when we did the Blue Ribbon Commission but it needs to come from here, it needs to come from here and it needs to be everybody.

THERIAULT: Commissioner Harvey, it might get tied up with the Naming Committee.

HARVEY: I'm just worried that if we have it, if we don't have it in a sub-committee, that it won't move as quickly. Some committees can meet more frequently than when we meet, we have workshops, that's what I'm a little concerned about.

SWEENEY: And I share that concern and there is a piece of this down the road where that's exactly what you do, you break this off in committees. I'm asking this Board to make a commitment to do some really radical change in this district to get this district moving and we have a blueprint for it, we have a blueprint...

HARVEY: I've heard those words in the past and that was when talking about the Ad-hoc Committee for the Achievement Gap but you see, we pretty much see where that's gone.

HAYES: That one's out of the box isn't it?

HARVEY: It's out of the box but I don't know...

SWEENEY: This isn't the first time I brought this up and I will continue to bring it up until we at least take some action on it and say yes we want to do that, we're ready to committee or no we don't want to do that we're not gonna commit to that. I'm fine with that, but let's get it going.

WHITE: Because this is based on the New Haven agreement, I'd like to know the makeup of the Board of Education in New Haven.

HAYES: They're an appointed Board, they're not elected.

WHITE: Why and how and anything else that comes with it. That's all.

ADJOURNMENT

Upon a motion by Commissioner Sweeney and duly seconded by Commissioner Stango, it was voted unanimously to adjourn at 10:10 p.m.

ATTEST: _____
Carrie A. Swain, Clerk
Board of Education