

A Workshop Meeting of the Board of Education, Seaford Union Free School District, was held on Wednesday, July 20, 2011, in the Band Room located in Seaford High School, 1575 Seamans Neck Road, Seaford, New York.

PRESENT: Mr. Brian W. Fagan - President
Mr. Richard G. DiBlasio – Vice President
Mr. Bruce Kahn – Trustee
Mr. Michael D. Sapraicone - Trustee

Mr. Brian L. Conboy
Mr. Kenney W. Aldrich
Mr. John Striffolino
Mr. Christopher Venator – Attorney (arrived 7:45 p.m.)

At 7:38 p.m., the President of the Board of Education opened the Workshop Meeting.

OPEN MEETING

None

OPENING REMARKS

None

PRESENTATIONS/RECOGNITIONS

Topics covered in Mr. Conboy's Administrative Report dated July 15, 2011:

ADMINISTRATIVE REPORT

Advisory Committee for Technology (ACT) – Areas

- July 18th cut-off date for receipt of letters of interest/resume
- Criteria for members, charter, who they will report to, how often they will meet

Fees for use of facilities by for-profit groups

APPR (Annual Professional Performance Review) – Areas covered in this discussion included:

- New regulation put in place in May
- Most difficult part of process is that many of the elements within the APPR regulation have to be negotiated
- 1st year –Teachers in grades 4-8 teaching ELA or Math and a principal in a building which has those grades and subjects in their building supposed to be subject to the APPR but it must be negotiated with the bargaining unit of those principals and those teachers
- New York State Teachers Union brought a lawsuit against New York State concerning many of the elements in the APPR and a decision may be made shortly
Most important point between NYSUT and the State is that if you have a settled contract then this must be negotiated for the successor contract of the current agreement
All of this is being litigated at the State level
- Our settled contracts with our principals goes to June 30, 2012
Our settled contract with our teachers goes to June 30, 2013
- Would like to start negotiating this as soon as possible
Letter was sent to UTS and they have agreed to begin negotiating in this school year with the proviso that whatever is negotiated is not put into place until the successor agreement comes up
- Planned attendance at Law Conference on Tuesday for superintendents related to this

Issue is that If we put into place now a new evaluation system for our teachers and our principals without negotiating could that be considered an unfair or improper labor practice because it was not negotiated

ADMINISTRATIVE REPORT – APPR (cont'd)

- On one hand the regulation requires you to negotiate it; on the other hand they are saying this is regulation – put it in place by September 2011
Conflicting language with the regulation
- By the second year every teacher and every principal will be evaluated using the new systems as is written in the regulation
- Teachers – 60% objective criteria, 20% state test results; 20% local assessments which have to be chosen and negotiated with bargaining units
- State will come out with list of assessment vendors which assessments will not be free
- Whole state data system is going to be based on how students do on state exams, who their teacher was, and who the principal was supervising that teacher
- Composite Grade at the end of every school year for every teacher and every principal
0-100 scale for teachers (top 2 considered posted; bottom 2 may be appealed)
91+ = Highly effective
75-90 = Effective
65-74 = Developing
0-64 = Ineffective
- Other areas discussed concerned:
 - No state tests for certain subjects
 - Must use approved rubrics
 - Rules concerning use of rubrics and assessments
 - Unique identifier
 - Local criteria

Christopher Venator – Attorney:

- Commissioner of Education has recommended beginning the process of negotiating whether or not you have contracts in place

8th Grade Accelerated Science-Moving From Earth Science To Biology – Areas covered in this discussion included:

- Plan to have 8th Grade Accelerated Class take Biology rather than Earth Science for the 2011/2012 school year
- Higher level science courses still available
- Long term goal – look at whether all 8th grade students would be able to take one or two regents exams before leaving Middle School
- Looking to involve more 8th Graders in higher levels skills and classes
- Biology more appropriate to this age level
- Strength of Middle School staff would be to teach Biology rather than Earth Science
- No disadvantage to students – opportunity to take Earth Science or AP Courses in the future still exists
- Most common Science certification of teachers is Biology
- Science Certifications
Traditionally 8th grade Earth Science, 9th advanced chemistry
- Science options to High School students
- Concerns over possible loss to students due to staff cuts
- Believe greater success taking Biology in 8th grade
- Still getting a regents level Science in 8th grade

ADMINISTRATIVE REPORT – 8TH GRADE SCIENCE (cont'd)

- Need to see choices available to students and how it works out through High School on a chart
- Expectation that every student who will takes the Biology Regents in 8th grade will reach mastery
- Choice of Earth Science or Biology could be given if we had the staff
- If it becomes very successful why not give it every 8th grader and find something else to give to the accelerated students
- Not always easy to compare one year to another – not all students are the same; need to be cautious in comparing one group of students to another
- Any student can take any AP Exam
- Administrative decisions are being made for the good of the students with a great deal of back-up information with discussion with teachers, district administrators and building administrators. If this doesn't work it means our advanced students failed biology which is unacceptable

Restructuring of 8th Grade Accelerated Science – concerns of repetitive information for those taking the AP Biology exam

**PUBLIC COMMENTS –
AGENDA ITEMS**

**NEW BUSINESS
CPSE/CSE**

Motion by Mr. DiBlasio, second by Mr. Sapricono, to approve acceptance of the determinations of the Special Education Committee Meetings listed below:

1. Recommend acceptance of the determinations of the Special Education Committee Meetings of: 3/22; 3/29; 5/11; 5/17; 5/25; 5/26; 5/31; 6/2; 6/14; 6/15; 3/9; 3/16; 4/6; 4/28; 5/3; 5/10; 5/18; 5/19; 5/25; 5/26; 5/31. For school year 2011/12: 6/2; 6/7; 6/8; 6/9; 6/14; 6/16; 6/17; 6/22; 6/23/11.
2. Recommend acceptance of the determinations of the Preschool Special Education Committee Meetings of: 3/23; 4/6; 4/14; 5/4; 5/11; 5/18; 5/25; 6/1; 6/2/11.

No Discussion.
All Ayes
Motion Carried.

Motion by Mr. DiBlasio, second by Mr. Sapricono, to approve the following:

CONTRACTS

1. Recommend the Board of Education approve a contract with Maryhaven Center of Hope for special education services and tuition for the 2011-2012 school year for one student, and authorize the Board President to sign the contract, subject to final review and approval by legal counsel.

No Discussion.
All Ayes
Motion Carried.

Mr. Conboy explained that on July 7th the Board approved a first reading of Policy #6600 but the copy enclosed in the Board's back up did not have the two edits made

POLICY #6600

He asked attorney Christopher Venator about the procedures concerning the approval of this policy. Mr. Conboy then read the revised policy and explained the reasons for the language changes

"...The Board directs the Treasurer to keep it informed of the financial status of the district through monthly cash reconciliation and budget status reports and annual fiscal reports and directs the Assistant Superintendent for Business to make monthly projections starting on February 1st of the end of the year fund balance. The Assistant Superintendent and the Treasurer should highlight any deviation in any actual fiscal conditions...."

He then explained that language was changed to have monthly projections starting February 1 because trying to make monthly projections on fund balance before that is very difficult to do until you see patterns of spending and patterns of bills, etc. The person responsible was also changed from the Treasurer to the Assistant Superintendent for Business to reflect responsibility within our District.

Other areas discussed:

- Change from quarterly to monthly for timeline of reports
- Any conflict of Treasurer's job description and with language of policy
- Current reports received monthly from the Treasurer compared to reports in policy
- Policy could be changed in the future if necessary

Areas covered in the lengthy discussion concerning whether the projections should begin on January 1 rather than February 1 included:

- Reason for February 1
- Amount of months covered in that report
- Need to be as accurate as possible
- Supply information to Budget Advisory Committee which begins in December
- Information is for the Board
- Revamp of Budget Advisory Committee
- Information contained in current monthly expenditure reports
- Policy is supposed to help us manage the district's finances
- Monthly number compared to where we were the last school year at the same time
- Already going from quarterly to monthly
- Summer months in a school district do not give you a sense of what your bills are- payments are; once school starts you get a better picture
- Budget talks start October/November between Administrators

It was decided that February 1 would remain as the date fund balance projections would begin.

Motion by Mr. Sapraine, second by Mr. Kahn, to amend the First Reading of Policy #6600 – Fiscal Accounting and Reporting as detailed in the board's documentation and approve the second reading of Policy #6600, as amended.

**SECOND READING
POLICY #6600**

No Discussion.
All Ayes
Motion Carried.

Administrative Report (cont'd):

ADMINISTRATIVE REPORT

Greiner-Maltz Contract:

Edits made to proposed contract by Antonia Hamblin of Ingerman, Smith

- Researched going compensation rates before making changes
- Removed “exclusive rights”

If Board is comfortable with changes, Ingerman, Smith will send contract back to Grenier-Maltz

Use of Facilities – “For Profit” Organizations – Areas covered in this discussion included:

WORKSHOP TOPIC: USE OF FACILITIES – “FOR PROFIT” ORGANIZATIONS

- Current “for-profit” rates listed in policy; does not have a rate for use of the turf field with or without lights
- Current rates for “not-for-profit” organizations listed in policy
- How often do “for profits” request use of the turf field
- Creation of rate for use of turf field with lights and for usage without lights
- 5% yearly increase will be reviewed yearly and adjusted as necessary

Selection Process for the Advisory Committee for Technology (ACT) – Areas covered in this discussion included:

- 7 Letters of interest/resumes were received
- Manner in which Audit Committee was created
- Advisory Committee for Technology not mandated
- Should have a limited charter so we have an exact sense of what they will be doing
- Ad for ACT stated committee would be analyzing hardware, software for the efficiency of the District and learning of the students – ultimately what they do will be so that students learn better
 - Committee members would be working with the Director of Technology
- Everyone who is interviewed for the committee should know what the commitment is
- Differences between Audit Committee and Technology Advisory Committee
- Learn from mistakes during the first year of the Audit Committee
- Who ACT Committee should report to – Board or Administration
- How large a committee are we looking for – Community and Director of Technology; Community, Director of Technology and district people
- Possible use of Audit Committee template
- Committee to file a report to be given to the Board
- No need for Chairperson; Controlling figure should be Director of Technology; Committee Secretary would be appointed by the Committee; Secretary would record notes/minutes/findings of Committee
- Every district required to develop a Technology Plan; have a District Technology committee made of district personnel, Director of technology and community members
 - Internal Technology Committee responsible for putting together District technology Plan (for E-Rate Funding) every 3 years, meeting
 - No need to have ACT and District Technology Committee which is currently place if they are going to be doing the same thing
 - If different need to know what those things are
 - Purpose of committees should not be same – internal committee made up of 12 people one year; 18 people another

ACT DISCUSSION (cont'd)

- Analysis of what we have, risks now and in the future, back-up plans, servers
 - Committee would meet to determine what we would need going forward and the cost, and how to blend that into our budget
 - ACT Committee – community members with Fred
 - Who the ACT should report to
 - Who/when reports should be given to from the ACT
 - Role of Board/Administration concerning reports from the ACT
 - Board to come up with ideas to be submitted to Board president
 - Not much decision-making do to our financial situations; more of a review of what are risks are for the future and what we can afford to make things better
 - How to deal with what we have and make it better for the district
 - When things open up it would be good to be prepared so that our kids will get the best
- Need is there to change what we have and put systems in place but we are not allowed to buy anything to do that
Community members need to come to this committee with a practical sense of where we are financially and what can happen going forward
- Have to have an understanding of where we have to go with the financial constraints we have

Mr. Conboy stated that no one is evaluating the Administrators in this District but him; that is the Superintendent's responsibility only.

He also stated that if we have people who want to get on this committee for the purpose of evaluating one of his administrators then there is no committee; there shouldn't be.

Mr. Conboy advised that this group of volunteers needs to analyze our systems not our administrators; advise the Board about our systems so the Administrator can administrate better.

After lengthy discussion the following was decided:

Director of Technology to be liaison between internal Technology Committee and the ACT

Questions from Board concerning ACT reports/minutes would be held until Board receives a report on the ACT recommendations from Administration
Make-up of the Advisory Committee for Technology (ACT):

- Fred Kaden, Director of Technology
 - Community Members (3 or 4 – Number to be Determined)
- Committee Meets: Bi-Monthly (minimum) – More as needed

Terms of Community Member: one (1) year terms to start
No Chairperson

Recording Secretary to be appointed by Committee

Duties of Recording Secretary: Take and type minutes of meetings, prepare reports and/or ACT recommendations, etc., as needed
Committee to review and approve their minutes/recommendations

Approved recommendations/minutes then given to District Clerk for distribution to the Board and Superintendent

Template for Agenda/Minutes to be created

Committee reports to Superintendent

ACT DISCUSSION (cont'd)

ACT Goals:

- Analyze systems (Risks, future risks, technology plan)
- Make recommendations (financially responsible)
- Pursue grants or notify administration of grants available
- Efficiencies

Will Superintendent be present at interviews for interim Board Trustee

- When to schedule interviews

August 4th Regular meeting postponed to August 11

- Board will do interviews for ACT Committee and perhaps the Interim Board Trustee position that evening

August 18th Workshop Meeting cancelled

Special Meeting scheduled for August 25th with the intention of going directly into Executive Session for the purpose of conducting interviews for the ACT and/or Interim Board position

Both August 11 and August 25th meetings will begin at 7:00 p.m.

September 1st Regular Meeting will begin at the regular time of 7:30 p.m.

Areas covered in the discussion on the selection process for Board Trustee included:

- Board may establish a criteria
- Possible Criteria for this position
 - Independent thinkers that can base opinion on fact
 - Experience
 - Conflicts
 - Understanding of commitment by prospective candidates
- Advertised on the District website, Wantagh/Seaford Citizen, Wantagh-Seaford Patch and District summer newsletter
- Timeframe to appoint Board member
- Should do what is best for the Board right now which will be best for the community
- Want to develop the dynamic that is a useful dynamic throughout the school year yet it has to be someone who has familiarity with the way meetings are run and an understanding of the way this type of system works

Comments, Questions and/or Concerns Raised by the Public included:

PUBLIC COMMENTS

- Status of Harbor Access Road re-vote
- Proposal to use Seaford High School (bathroom/Nurse's office) for parent-paid/approved drug-testing program; no cost to district at all
Description of program
- Think about and consider what the community would want in a candidate when you select the individual for the interim Board trustee position
What is the Board doing to gauge what the community wants; what the Board may want or what fits in with the Board may not be what the community might want to have

PUBLIC COMMENTS (cont'd)

Administration/Board comments:

**ADMINISTRATION/BOARD
COMMENTS**

Mr. Conboy:

- Harbor Roadway Vote Should be something to be discussed to happen within this school year
If able to make some headway on Seaford Avenue property where we have a proposal to bring to our residents then perhaps we again could come to the public with the Roadway project
Feeling that we will probably only get one more vote on the roadway project and if the community decides it's not what it wants then would recommend to the Board to use the monies related to approved projects

Mr. Venator – Attorney:

- Believe would require some level of contractual relationship between the organization and the District because it is being done on our kids on our time
Need to look at issues concerning student ages
Need to speak to NYSIR concerning insurance issues for the District

Administration/Board:

Comments/concerns over proposed drug-testing program included

- Student privacy issues
Are Tests for wide array of things students could take
Liability to school
Why don't do this in homes
Student involvement from the beginning should be part of the contract
How does this information get to families
Unsure if District building right venue to start this program

Mr. Kahn asked about a memo from Mr. Ward referenced in Mr. Conboy's administration report concerning the purchase of transportation vehicle, possibly a golf cart, for use in security at events.

Mr. Kahn expressed concerns that the Bronco organization is not being charged for field usage for the Viking Football/Bronco Football Clinic. He also expressed concerns over facilities usage/charges issues in the future. Mr. Kahn stated that he did not want to charge anyone but on Contingency Budget we are required to by law. He then referenced the resolution passed by the Board at the July Reorganization meeting.

Mr. Conboy advised that this is a clinic being given voluntarily by District coaches and players. District coaches filled out use of facilities application for use of the facilities to put on a free football clinic. Our coaches and players invited the Broncos to a clinic for the younger players. No one is being charged and no one is being paid.

A brief discussion took place concerning the Board resolution, use of facilities by outside groups and for school-related events while on contingency budget.

None

CLOSING REMARKS

At 10:48 p.m., a motion was made by Mr. DiBlasio, second by Mr. Sapricono to adjourn the Workshop Meeting and enter into Executive Session for the purpose of discussing specific contractual matters.

**ADJOURN WORKSHOP
MEETING**

No Discussion.
All Ayes
Motion Carried.

There being no further business, a motion was made by Mr. Sapricono, second by Mr. Kahn, to adjourn Executive Session at 11:40 p.m.

**ADJOURN EXECUTIVE
SESSION**

No Discussion.
All Ayes
Motion Carried.

Respectfully submitted,

Carmen T. Ouellette
District Clerk

Bruce Kahn,
Vice District Clerk