

**MINUTES OF THE PATERSON BOARD OF EDUCATION
SPECIAL MEETING**

February 10, 2016 - 6:09 p.m.
Administrative Offices

Presiding: Comm. Christopher Irving, President

Present:

Dr. Donnie Evans, State District Superintendent
Ms. Eileen Shafer, Deputy Superintendent
Lisa Pollak, Esq., General Counsel

Comm. Oshin Castillo
Comm. Chrystal Cleaves, Vice President
*Comm. Jonathan Hodges
*Comm. Errol Kerr

*Comm. Lilisa Mimms
Comm. Nakima Redmon
Comm. Flavio Rivera
Comm. Kenneth Simmons

The Salute to the Flag was led by Comm. Irving.

Comm. Castillo read the Open Public Meetings Act:

The New Jersey Open Public Meetings Act was enacted to insure the right of the public to have advance notice of, and to attend the meetings of the Paterson Public School District, as well as other public bodies at which any business affecting the interest of the public is discussed or acted upon.

In accordance with the provisions of this law, the Paterson Public School District has caused notice of this meeting:

**Special Meeting
February 10, 2016 at 6:00 p.m.
Administrative Offices
90 Delaware Avenue
Paterson, New Jersey**

to be published by having the date, time and place posted in the office of the City Clerk of the City of Paterson, at the entrance of the Paterson Public School offices, on the district's website, and by sending notice of the meeting to the Arab Voice, El Diario, the Italian Voice, the North Jersey Herald & News, and The Record.

*Comm. Kerr enters the meeting at 6:10 p.m.

Comm. Irving: I want to welcome everyone this evening on a very auspicious occasion and day for this district. At this point in time, I'm going to in a second turn it over to Dr. Evans, Ms. Shafer, and then I'll have some remarks. As you all know, the State Board of Education today voted to return the aspects of local control regarding finance and personnel. This is a very important moment in our district, for all of you, our children, and our city. We asked you all to be here this evening as we discuss what this means for us as a district and also as we discuss the budget priorities and realities facing us. I'm so thankful to everyone for being here. I must say the elephant in the room I think

our students would be in dismay at the fact that everybody is sitting in the back and the seats in the front are empty. I'm just pointing it out. I teach at the university and everybody always goes all the way to the back, but we're so glad you're all here.

Dr. Evans: As our President has indicated, today is one of those very special days in the history of our school district. For that reason, we invited principals and other key staff members to come and participate and indeed celebrate with us our accomplishments of the day. Those familiar with our seven transformation initiatives know that one of them is efficient and responsive district operations. One of the major initiatives aligned with this objective is our local governance initiative, or stated more succinctly, the move to local control with the focus on meeting all of the requirements of the QSAC standards. QSAC, as you know, is the Quality Single Accountability Continuum. Almost two years ago the New Jersey Department of Education returned the operations DPR, District Performance Review, for continuous and sustained performance. That performance had to total 80 points using a scale that the Department of Education devised. Today, because of sustained performance in two additional areas, the State Board of Education voted unanimously to return two additional DPR areas because of high-performance demonstrated by the district. These are fiscal management and personnel. Indeed, immediately following today's meeting planning began on the development of transition plans that are being developed by the Department of Education that will drive the transition from state control to local control. As our President asked the attorney for the DOE today, it is being expedited to go ahead and put it in place as quickly as possible. In the coming weeks and months plans will also evolve on how the district must proceed to demonstrate that we can and will meet the standards in the other two DPR areas, instruction and program and governance. Indeed, the Department of Education has indicated a desire to return those two areas to us as quickly as possible as well once we demonstrate clearly that we are maintaining sustained performance, particularly in instruction and personnel. I am extremely grateful to those who made today's award possible, starting with our teachers, principals, district-level staff, the Board, community partners, which include university partners, faith-based partners, community partners, Rosie Grant with PEF, Linda with PEOC. I thank all of you for participating. This is indeed an example of our village coming together to make good things happen for the children of our district to ensure that they have brighter futures. A special thank you also to Ms. Shafer and T.J. Best because they led the work around QSAC that made this possible. Those of you who worked closely with them know that sometimes they were very unforgiving if you didn't deliver when they asked you to deliver. That's what got us here. So a special thank you to them as well as Daisy Ayala and Luis Rojas who are the current leaders for the two units for which the DPR and control was returned today. At this point, I will turn it over to Ms. Shafer to make some additional comments.

*Comm. Hodges enters the meeting at 6:15 p.m.

Ms. Shafer: Thank you, Dr. Evans. I, too, want to congratulate all of our staff, administrators, and Board of Education for working together as we continue to get back local control. Also today the Superintendent presented to the State Board of Education his annual report where he highlighted our successes and also the challenges that we continue to have and the work that still needs to be done. Through that he shared a lot of the district data and I'm sure many of you saw that our own School 28 was the highest performing school in Passaic County on PARCC. In addition to many other accomplishments the graduation rate continues to go up over the years since Dr. Evans has been here. We also know that there is still much work to be done. I know Dr. Evans spent some late evenings here over the past couple of weeks preparing and putting this report together as well as taking it home. He certainly represented us well.

I also want to thank Terry Corallo for taking the lead in putting the report together along with her staff George, Alan, and Ada. Also, I want to thank all the Cabinet because it was all of the Cabinet members who were able to gather the data, information, and updates to put the report together. Thank you to all of you. You can see the annual report and the PowerPoint presentation on our website. Thank you.

Dr. Evans: Ms. Shafer just recognized School 28. If it's alright with you, even though it's on the agenda, I'd also like to recognize one additional school. It goes off the agenda in a different sequence. Oh, she's not here yet.

Comm. Irving: When they get here whatever that is we'll just jump right in and recognize them.

Dr. Evans: Thank you.

Comm. Irving: Let me say this. This Board, not just the folks who were elected sitting on this dais, but for the last 24 years the members who have come and gone and served diligently has worked tirelessly with the State and the State-Operated Superintendent to help bring us to this point. I think that what we as a currently elected Board members received today we sit on their shoulders and the hard work of people like Irene Sterling and Rosie Grant, Linda Reid, Fernando, and some of the other folks who work in community organizing here in Paterson. Most importantly, we stand on the shoulders of all the administrators and teachers who have served since the time the state-takeover began. Some of you sitting in this audience can remember the time when Frank Napier was here and served as our last locally controlled appointed superintendent of schools and the time thereafter. As a district we've seen good times and bad times. It is now an opportunity for us as a community to turn the corner of equal representation for the folks who are left and the individuals who sit around this table and ensure that the voice of the people of the City of Paterson are effectively and clearly heard. Let me just clarify a few things. For folks wondering what does this mean for us as a district hopefully it doesn't mean much as far as the way we change and operate. For those who have attended our meetings you know that this Board has operated and voted like a fully empowered Board for how long, Dr. Hodges?

Comm. Hodges: 2003 or 2004.

Comm. Irving: 2003 to 2004. All that change is about process and protocol. Dr. Evans and I had a great conversation. I think he phrased it appropriately. We go from a process of in some ways the resolutions that you all submit in which you're telling us what you're doing to now you all are asking us and have to support, document, and be able to demonstrate the capacity for how you plan to change and support the change in this district by doing whatever action items you have. To me that is no different than what I know my colleagues have asked in instruction and program, finance, the operations area, and facilities. I ask Dr. Evans to ensure that we ask all staff to be here because although this is a very important day it should not change the way we operate and our expectations of each other from staff to the Board and Board to the staff. But I do want to make it very clear that this Board is now empowered with the responsibility and authority for finance, operations, and personnel, and sees this responsibility as an important one, one that we will interject and execute with fidelity and most importantly one we will hold all staff accountable for. Our expectation is that staff will help meet that need, the Superintendent and Cabinet will help facilitate that, but most importantly I thank you all for your years of service to this district. I thank you all for dealing with the pros and cons of state operation. There are ambiguities that sometimes come with it. You are the folks in the trenches. You are the folks who have to deal with all the

regulations and the back channel red tape. Nonetheless, you find your way through it. You find a way to continue to care about our kids and to ensure that the children of this city get the best opportunity they can, which is to live the American Dream in order to move themselves forward. We thank you all for being here. I'm going to ask that you all stay at least until the presentation of the budget. I'm sure some of you have questions regarding the fiscal realities of our district and some of the issues we're having. At the end of the budget presentation which shouldn't be too long and probably about 45 minutes from now we'll take a brief recess. If folks have to leave after that, please feel free to do so. But it will be a good opportunity to break and to allow folks if you have to leave to do so without disrupting the meeting. I hope you will stick around for the budget presentation because I think this is the first time we've ever asked principals, administrators, and supervisors to sit down with us and listen to what are some of the proposed budget changes. There's no better night than tonight to have this discussion. Thank you all for being here and please give yourselves a round of applause for doing such an amazing job for this district. Thank you so much.

RESOLUTIONS FOR A VOTE:

Resolution No. 1

Whereas, the Paterson Internal Audit Unit conducted a review of fire and security drills performed by Paterson School District (District) schools to ensure compliance with N.J.S.A. 18A:41, C.App.A:9-86, and the New Jersey Fire Code. In the District, the Office of Security Services maintains the records of school security drills and the Facilities Department maintains the records of fire drills.

Whereas, the Paterson Public School District has attached an addendum of drills that were conducted during the 2014-2015 school year which were not provided to the internal auditors upon initial review.

Therefore Be It Resolved, the Internal Audit has completed its review and noted deficiencies. The following correction action plan addresses these deficiencies.

It was moved by Comm. Cleaves, seconded by Comm. Redmon that Resolution No. 1 be adopted. On roll call all members voted in the affirmative, except Comm. Hodges who voted no, Comm. Hodges who abstained on anything pertaining to himself, the YMCA, and Jumpstart, Comm. Irving who abstained on anything pertaining to the Workforce Investment Board and Passaic County One Stop, and Comm. Rivera who abstained on anything dealing with the NJCDC, if necessary. The motion carried.

Resolution No. 2

Approve an extension of the lease for 200 Sheridan Avenue (Spectrachem Realty LLC).

Whereas, the operation of public schools that are clean, safe, and aligned with 21st Century Learning Standards is Goal 4 of Priority 2 of the 2014-2019 Strategic Plan for the Paterson Public School District (the "District");

Whereas, the District is the lessee of certain real property located at 200 Sheridan Street in Paterson, New Jersey pursuant to a Lease Agreement (the "Lease") between the District, as tenant, and Spectrachem Realty LLC, as landlord;

Whereas, the parties previously extended the term of the Lease until January 31, 2016; and

Whereas, the parties now agree to extend the Lease on a month-to-month basis until March 31, 2016, with no other change in Lease terms or conditions.

Now, Therefore, Be It Resolved That, the District approves this extension of its Lease Agreement with Spectrachem Realty LLC, on a month-to-month basis from February 1, 2016 until March 31, 2016, at a monthly rental rate of \$30,666.05, for a total cost not to exceed \$61,332.10.

It was moved by Comm. Cleaves, seconded by Comm. Castillo that Resolution No. 2 be adopted.

Comm. Irving: This is just to extend the lease for the next two months as we renegotiate?

Comm. Kerr: I assume that after the two-month period we will be deciding on a full lease.

Comm. Irving: I believe we're in negotiations.

Ms. Pollak: Yes. This is just holding the rent for the next two months steady. Then we will enter into a lease which will probably run from April 1 through the end of the school year, the fiscal year for us, with anticipation of a lease for the following years. They want a long-term lease, but we're still waiting for them to complete some repairs there.

Comm. Irving: Fair enough.

Comm. Hodges: Am I to understand we pay something on the order of \$4 million a year for this property?

Ms. Pollak: No.

Comm. Hodges: It's \$30,000 a month.

Ms. Pollak: \$30,000 a month.

Comm. Hodges: Times 12 months. I'm sorry. I meant \$400,000. It's \$400,000 a year for this particular piece of property.

Ms. Pollak: Correct.

Comm. Hodges: Which we're only using for facilities and a storehouse.

Comm. Irving: And food services as well.

Comm. Hodges: Do we have the square footage?

Mr. Steve Morlino: It's about 30,000 plus square feet.

Comm. Irving: Are there any other questions Mr. Morlino can answer since he's up here?

Mr. Morlino: Just for clarification, part of the reason for the short lease is there are structural issues the landlord has already corrected and with that there are some roofing and building envelope issues that they have to correct in order for us to consider a longer term lease.

Comm. Irving: In the facilities and finance committees, we supported this because we did not want to lock the district into a lease on a facility that certainly has some major repairs that need to get done. So I think by holding the landlord to the fire us not signing it spurred him or them to take care of these repairs.

Mr. Morlino: There's a lot of work going on right now.

Comm. Hodges: Holding their feet to the fire would be holding off the rent. So we anticipate they're going to go ahead and complete all of the repairs?

Mr. Morlino: They are going to complete the repairs. They claim they need the monthly rent to do so, but they are in the process. Last week they boomed a lot of material onto the roof and have started major repairs on the building.

Comm. Hodges: So the \$400,000, do we anticipate having a significant increase in that?

Mr. Morlino: There are discussions about the increase and it is being negotiated. We have not entered into those discussions until the building meets our needs from a standpoint of being watertight.

Comm. Irving: Are there any other questions?

On roll call all members voted in the affirmative, except Comm. Hodges who abstained on anything pertaining to himself, the YMCA, and Jumpstart, Comm. Irving who abstained on anything pertaining to the Workforce Investment Board and Passaic County One Stop, and Comm. Rivera who abstained on anything dealing with the NJCDC, if necessary. The motion carried.

PRESENTATIONS AND COMMUNICATIONS

DeJong Firm Presentation

Dr. Evans: As the Board and staff are aware, this fall two new schools will open. Hani Awadallah and School 16 will both open as elementary schools in our school district. District staff has been charged with developing an attendance area for each school, which means modifying our current configuration to populate those schools. We've engaged DeJong Richter to help us with that task and David has been very helpful in providing for us options for us to look at. Indeed, we have invited him here tonight to share those options with the Board.

Dr. Linda Crescione: Good evening Commissioners. I just want to share that there will be two documents that are being passed out to you this evening. One contains the PowerPoint that David will present for you and the other document addresses an issue that was raised at the last Board workshop in January where it was discussed that the demographic information for the schools wasn't available because we didn't identify the boundaries. In addition to the larger handout, there is a document which identifies the demographic information for all of the schools which will be impacted by this change. You will see it broken down in four ways – by Race/Ethnicity, Country of Birth, LEP

Status, and Home Primary Language. With that, I just wanted to present that information and welcome David to the stage. Thank you.

Mr. David Sturtz: Thank you very much. Thanks for having me. Again, my name is David Sturtz. I'm with DeJong Richter. Alex Boyer is with me as well. He's the man behind the scenes with the data and the maps. We've prepared a PowerPoint presentation with a summary of three boundary options for you to consider. We can talk about the differences there. Then we also bring the maps with us. In the middle of my presentation if you'd like to interrupt, please feel free to interrupt me at any point in the presentation with a question and at the end we're going to open it up for Q&A as well. If you'd like to drill down and to look at the individual street level data, student data, or boundary data and all those kinds of things we can do that as much as you'd like.

Comm. Irving: My preference would be for you to go through your presentation. I'm sure the Board will have questions. Then there might be some opportunity for us to engage in discussion outside of the context of this. We're just receiving this tonight. So for the group to absorb it and understand it and figure it out, it's going to take some opportunity for us to look at this on our own and then probably reach back out. Dr. Evans, is the expectation that we're voting on this next month or this month?

Dr. Evans: We'd like to vote by early March at the latest. Things are beginning to happen. Parents are registering their kindergarten and in some cases pre-k because there are implications for pre-k here as well. We don't necessarily want to have to go back and make adjustments.

Comm. Irving: I'm just trying to make sure our timeline makes sense. We'll have it presented tonight and then the Board can have at least a few weeks to really vet this and bring it back for discussion, either at the first workshop meeting in March or at a special meeting thereafter.

*Comm. Mimms enters the meeting at 6:39 p.m.

Dr. Evans: Sure.

Mr. Sturtz: I will send you the PowerPoint as well and you can have that. In the boundary process we start with your current boundaries. We have the student level data that we're able to geo-code and put on the maps so we know where your current students live, what grades they're in, what school they're are boundaried to, and what school they attend. Those two things can be different. When we looked at it, there were a couple of things that we noted as some challenges. One of the first challenges in your current boundary situation is that you have several separate boundary islands for some of your schools. For example, the arrows pointed there on the screen may be a little hard to see, but those are three separate areas for the MLK School. There are three separate boundary islands for MLK and the school doesn't even reside in it. School 15 is the same way. There's a boundary on the east, a boundary on the west, they're separated, and the school is not in the boundary. When you do that you have lots of neighborhoods that are frankly disjointed with the way that the boundaries are currently set. What you also have is some imbalance in your utilization. I'm going to show you what that means. Currently in your schools on the grade column is the capacity of your building as we determined it in August 2014 when we walked your schools and we looked at the room use for every room, what it was used for, if it was a reasonable threshold of square footage. For example, a classroom needed to be at least 650 square feet to be considered a classroom. If you have a classroom in a small office it doesn't get full capacity. If it's a full classroom is gets full classroom capacity. If

it's a resource room or a special education room it gets a lower capacity. We walked all your buildings and we came up with that functional capacity. We should note that is a different capacity from the way the state calculates, which we did differently in the master plan for the state's purposes. We look at this as what are you currently doing and then how many students you can currently educate based on that, which means that you can have some variances as the program changes, but they're usually slight year to year. Then in the center column there you see students currently living in that boundary. So we looked at how many students are geo-coded within each of your current school boundaries and then you see the different. At MLK the capacity is about 938 students and the students living in the boundary are 598. Then you go to Roberto Clemente and the capacity is a little over 400 and the students residing in that boundary are almost 600. So you have to move students out and move students in. What that sums up to is among these nine schools you have over 1,100 students different between the students living in the boundaries and those attending their home school. You have a lot of fluidity there within your current boundaries. When we looked at these new boundaries for School 16 and Hani Awadallah we had to necessarily impact the neighboring boundaries in order to accommodate all the students and balance that enrollment. When we were doing that we looked at these current situations and said in the process of balancing that we can also work to make sure that school boundaries are all united, that when we create the school boundaries they fit the enrollment of the students that live within them so we can be more sure that this boundary fits the students that actually live in it. In all the boundary options that we're going to present to you, the students who live in that boundary fit the enrollment capacity for that school. You don't have to move students from school to school looking for where there's space. In the process, we geo-coded all your students, we looked at the current live-in enrollment, how many students live in that boundary, and then we also contrasted that with the attendance and we got two utilization scores with the utilization of all the facilities based on where students live in your boundaries, and utilization based on how students attend those schools. We focused on where students live and we looked at the walking routes to make sure that when we are reconfiguring these boundaries and creating these boundary options that the longest distance point to point in the boundary is reasonable and that there's a good shot walking route there and to try to eliminate situations where students are walking past one school to attend another. We also considered the Newcomers center and pre-k. We understood the district's desire to put the Newcomers center into New School 16. To do that, in that option the boundary for School 16 is smaller than in the first two options to accommodate the Newcomers center. I'll show you that all here in a minute. With all the options here you have Option 1, the live-in enrollment with the live-in utilization; Option 2, the live-in enrollment with the live-in utilization; and Option 3, because we are putting the Newcomers center into School 16 we considered the transfer rates to students. I'll go into that in a little more detail here. The next slide gets down into which students are moving in and out of those boundaries. I know the coloring scheme here is a little hard for me to see with the angle of the screen, but you want to typically try to be in the mid 80's to about 90% utilization for your k-8 schools. Of your maximum capacity that we calculated by walking your schools if possible you'd like to be about 85% to 90% of that for your k-8, and 90% to 95% of that for your elementary schools. It's an inefficiency factor you build in for the fact that kids don't come in nice little buckets and they go in every school in every period of the day. Currently you have some schools that are fairly low utilized and some particularly with what we have with School 25. We had to work on reducing that utilization. You were overcrowded. In the third option there we looked at the transfers into each school based upon magnet programs. We assumed the Newcomers going into School 16. We looked at 10 of your districtwide magnets that students are traveling to and they'll likely continue to travel to because it's a Choice program. We looked at students moving in and out of the school. What is the net of that? In other words, we

look at how many students live in that boundary. We add in those who would transfer in and we subtract those who are transferring out. We see what your net probable enrollment at that school and what that utilization is. As you can see, at this point all of the options in the previous slide here take away a lot of those red numbers and you see a lot of green. Green is good. Green is in that healthy utilization. Blue is you have a little extra room. We have in each case one school that's added capacity by a few students over. That's an assumption based upon what students are moving in. We got it as close as we could and if you're at 102% capacity realistically speaking you're full. It's not way over because kids move and there are little variances here and there. We cleaned up a lot of that red and we got it into a nice utilization for all of the options and different ways. If you look at the live-in enrollment for School 16 in Option 3 it's 55%, which is very low. The reason we did that is in order to accommodate Newcomers and pre-k. Options 1 and 2 do not do that. What I wanted to show you was just some images. I'm first going to do a compare/contrast on Options 1 and 2 for each school. In the first two options, Hani Awadallah's boundary is exactly the same. That's based on the assumption that we're keeping Newcomers where it is. In Martin Luther King both of the boundaries are contiguous. We took out all of the three boundary islands and put them together into one. It's simply a matter of different ways to get to similar utilization. You see in the second option we take everything that hugs the boundary of Route 80 there and north goes into Martin Luther King. In Option 1 we condensed that a little bit and shifted elsewhere. In School 16 assuming the Newcomers would stay where it was or go elsewhere the first option we have School 16 hugging the Route 80 border and then in Option 2 it goes more north. Roberto Clemente's boundaries are a shuffling of where the students are, but it keeps it all together. School 8 is identical in both options for 1 and 2. School 9 is identical. School 13 changes very slightly. It's hard to see this coloration right now on the screen, but they're very similar. For Options 1 and 2 for School 15 there's a very slight difference. They're almost identical. School 20 is identical between the two. School 24 shifts which blocks go into the school, but they keep them all together in one line. All of the surrounding schools around School 15 and Hani Awadallah we first did not set out anticipating how many boundaries would be affected. We start with how many kids we have in the whole area, how much capacity we have, and where are these new schools. As we put those together it's like a domino set. As you start to move this part and you get these kids in here you're draining this school. So we have to move that out and now this one's overloaded so we have to move this. We just chased it north until we're able to set a boundary that fits all the students that you have and make sure that we respect the geography, keeping boundaries together, and we're fitting within the enrollment. School 25 is identical as well. The third option we're showing you as a contrast to the current. That's a summary picture right there of the third option. With Hani Awadallah in the bottom left there that has that little notch into School 9. Then catty-corner to that northeast you have School 16 right below Martin Luther King and School 24. As we did this, School 8 is very similar to the first two options. School 9 we wanted to relieve a little more. That's why we took that notch there into School 9. When we did that we were able to create a little space for School 25. We were able to push Railway there. Gould is the transfer street over there. We did the walking distance and it was about half a mile in the long point. That was still functional for walkability. Then you currently have students from School 25 in that area north of Route 80. In order to keep Martin Luther King's enrollment down from being over 100% we kept those students who were north of Route 80 in. We originally looked at options in 1 and 2 that did not have that. But when we ended up putting the Newcomers center in this boundary option into School 16, that expanded that whole area that had to be taken either by School 25 or Martin Luther King. School 25 had room and Martin Luther King didn't. We kept that as is and then we worked our way north. So as a contrast, there is no Hani Awadallah right now. That's the current boundary in Option 3. This is the boundary for School 16 and you can see it's much

smaller. This is where we have the 355 students in that area allowing for Newcomers and pre-k. For Martin Luther King you can see the contrast right there. On the left is the current boundary and on the right is the recommendation. It brings it all together. School 8 is quite similar. We just took a notch out of the bottom there when Hani Awadallah fits in there. Left is the current and the right is the recommendation on Option 3 for School 9. Then working over to School 13 is the same as the current. When you look at the utilization for School 13, this is a lot to absorb. It's a lot of maps and data. It's a good thing you have a month or so to chew on it. We've been chewing on it for months and that's why we're able to talk about it. You'll see that the utilization for School 13 appears to go up. That's assuming that the students who live in that boundary now will attend that school, as opposed to being put elsewhere because there's no space. That's the idea. We wanted to make sure that kids go to school that they are boundaried to and that's closer to them, and schools and parents know year to year what school they're going to. One of the benefits you have as a densely populated area is that where individual families may move from time to time as a whole the district is built out. So you have population stability at a macro level. We're trying to create boundaries for you that can last for the long haul. You wouldn't have to look at boundary changes on a reoccurring basis. You set something that's going to work and it can stay conceivably for quite some time. We bring School 15 together from its two separate parts. School 20 is just a little bit different there based on where MLK's boundary moves. For School 24, with the yellowing of the screen it's hard to pick up the contrast there, but we bring all the separate pieces together on that one. School 25 is very similar. We just took out the carve out there just south of Route 80 for School 9. With that run through and lots of pictures and data we have the maps up there and you can ask questions of any of the three options that we have and any of the data behind the options, utilizations, or what have you. Let me turn it over to you and we'll go from there.

Comm. Irving: Thank you. Are there any questions from the Board members? I just have two. I think that we're going to need time to digest the maps that are here and then come back and have a working session about the boundaries. The first question I have, if you'll allow me, is in which incarnation of the maps or Options 1, 2 or 3 will students be shifted from one school to another? Are there scenarios in which students may have to leave a particular school because we readjusted boundaries?

Mr. Sturtz: Yes.

Comm. Irving: That stuff we need to know.

Mr. Sturtz: We can get you all of those numbers as to probably what students will be moved.

Comm. Irving: Is that in here?

Mr. Sturtz: That's not in that report, but I can get you that. We have that data.

Comm. Irving: Please.

Mr. Sturtz: The truth is that you're going to have to move quite a number of students. There's really no way around it when you put in Hani Awadallah.

Comm. Irving: In all three options?

Mr. Sturtz: When you open the two new schools, you're putting two new boundaries in there because you needed that. Among the 11 schools now you're going to have quite a bit.

Comm. Irving: I think it's equally important to present to this Board the population transition or density of the respective area in each map and then an allocation for what it will mean as far as the population relocation.

Mr. Sturtz: I think that information would be good to uphold next to how many students currently have to leave that area because of under or over utilization.

Comm. Irving: That's what I mean.

Mr. Sturtz: When you do this in any of the three options you're going to move home schools for quite a number of students. What you will do then is move them into a home school that they have capacity to attend for the long haul. We just want to contrast that with any kind of fluidity of where they have to move now because there isn't room. We can get you all that information.

Comm. Irving: Dr. Crescione, if we can get that information as soon as possible it would just help me to be able to digest the options here coupled with the impact. I think we're being asked to evaluate what's expedient, but also we have to factor in what's going to be fair for families and kids to be able to execute as well. I think you have to be able to leverage both if we're going to make a decision.

Comm. Kerr: Now we're talking about Choice. How do we balance all of this with Choice?

Dr. Evans: That's a good question.

Mr. Sturtz: I could comment from a boundary and demographic perspective and I'll let Dr. Evans speak from an educational perspective. From a boundary perspective, several of the schools there where the utilizations are in the high 70%, if 78% of the students live in this boundary there's room for about 20% more kids. You know that that Choice program could have a home there for a long time. How you then allow students to opt into that is a programmatic thing that doesn't have any boundary impact. So long as there's capacity at that school for the kids who live in that boundary you could allow any folks to come on in provided that it didn't exceed that school's capacity.

Comm. Kerr: What about the reverse of that?

Mr. Sturtz: Give me an example.

Comm. Kerr: You live in a particular boundary but you don't want to be in that school.

Mr. Sturtz: Whenever you look at a boundary process, one of the things we recommend to districts is that you have a phase-in period on a case-by-case basis. If you have a school that's not hemorrhaging way over its utilization, you could give folks a grandfather clause to say we're going to change this boundary effective 2018-2019. You can choose in that period to attend the school that you're being rebounded to or to stay at this school for that point at which time we switch. You could have a preference for sibling groups. The transition time here matters based upon your needs and timelines. It's a decision to be made above and beyond our options.

Dr. Evans: The other option is expanding the first option that David shared. It provides additional Choice options. If you have a school that has 78% capacity, students could choose into that school in ways they can't now. In fact, we will have more schools with that kind of capacity. So Choice becomes an important option for us to give to parents if indeed we decide we want to do that. But more Choice would be an opportunity for our youngsters.

Comm. Kerr: So this effectively can also victimize some kids because if you're living in a particular boundary and as a parent you decide you don't want your child to go to that school that would fall into that boundary, what do you tell that parent?

Dr. Evans: If indeed we expand Choice then they could apply to choose to go to another school. As Superintendent I'd want to know why. What is it about the school they're in that compels them to ask for another school, not to take advantage of a special program or some other offering that school may have. I'd want to know that. If it's a safety issue, I'd want to know that. If it's another issue, if it's the streets and walking to that school, I'd want to know that. So we can address it.

Comm. Kerr: But you and I know that the situation exists even now that there are certain schools no parent wants their child to be in. If we are going to exercise Choice and give those parents the right to decide where their children go we just might have to take out that neighborhood school because nobody is going to want to send their children to that school. We know that exists now. I don't want to call any number or name, but we do know that there are schools that exist in our district that given Choice no child would be in that school.

Dr. Evans: We've had circumstances like that and we have been successful in turning them around by addressing the issue. I can give you examples of that as well. There were schools where parents did identify the school as problematic in terms of wanting their child to go there. We addressed it and now they're happy. In fact, other parents want to get in that school.

Comm. Hodges: I'm not quite as sanguine about your latter point, Dr. Evans, but I will say this. When you open up two new schools there's an opportunity to address some of the very issues that Mr. Kerr is talking about in terms of programming. Some of the more challenging programs in administration might benefit from going to the newer buildings because what tends to happen is the newer building itself attracts people who don't normally go there. That's why I'm a little disappointed with the big rush to put this together when I think a larger discussion needs to be held about what should go into these brand new schools and what kinds of programs and educational needs should be addressed as a way of convincing people who would not normally go some places to go those places. They can be encouraged to be engaged in these programs that they wouldn't normally take advantage of. It's that conversation that I think the Board would benefit from and needs to have before we jump to this level. That's why I'm a little disappointed. I'm hoping that we can take a step back and really think this out differently.

Dr. Evans: Understood. Mr. President, I don't disagree with what Dr. Hodges just said, but there was a community-based committee that informed this work. I would advise that they participate in that discussion to explain why they supported moving in a particular direction as well. They were from the community.

Comm. Irving: That's fine.

Comm. Hodges: I don't have a problem with that.

Comm. Rivera: I have three questions. We're redrawing the boundaries because we're building new schools?

Mr. Sturtz: Yes, sir.

Comm. Rivera: We already had a School 16 there previously. Why do we have to redraw that boundary?

Mr. Sturtz: When you have Hani Awadallah coming in, that pushes everything. That school alone would drive this because then you're pushing into School 9 and School 25. Just Hani Awadallah itself drives the need to change these boundaries.

Dr. Evans: In addition, School 16, at least in 2009, was an alternative school. I'm sure years before then it was a different school, a high school or elementary, but it was an alternative school.

Comm. Rivera: That's fine. The second question should be fast. When did we start the process to do this exercise?

Mr. Sturtz: We got data the first of the year.

Comm. Rivera: Of this year?

Mr. Sturtz: We got the current student enrollment data and started preplanning last year. We got the current student data the first of the year.

Comm. Rivera: That's interesting. This is not my field, it's yours. That's why I'm asking the question. Did we take into account the long-range facility plan that the district had, which as Dr. Evans just stated, used the input from the community to determine what the community preferred as the use of that school?

Mr. Sturtz: We actually facilitated that master plan for the last year. In that plan there was the moving out of the Newcomers center into School 16. It was tossed out as an idea among several others. That was a backdrop. We were intimately familiar with that.

Comm. Rivera: I'm going to re-ask the question. What did the people want that took place in this? I wasn't even on the Board at that time. That was done a long time ago. What did the community want at the time that this was done? What was their preference for that building?

Mr. Sturtz: For Hani Awadallah or School 16?

Comm. Rivera: School 16.

Mr. Sturtz: What we discussed in the steering committee and some of you all here where in there was for a Full Service Community School. A dual language academy was an option, if I recall correctly. A Newcomers center was tossed in there. We had a variety, but we did not settle in on one final option. In recommendations there were so many programs moving at the end of our process that our recommendation is we need to put the brakes on deciding exactly what program is going to go in here until the dust settles. It's our recommendation so we put our stamp on it. I didn't want to put a recommendation on program moves specifically until other programs had been moved.

Comm. Rivera: I understand that. My question was not what you decided. My question was what did the steering committee for the community want? Not what your organization decided about it. What did the committee decide?

Dr. Evans: It's actually in the facilities plan. Linda has a copy of it.

Dr. Crescione: Comm. Rivera, in the original presentation it was included in the packet. It was the recommendation at that particular time. It just had options. We have to remember the purpose for the building of the school was for overcrowding. However, it says Full Service Community School, dual language academy, and Newcomers center, which is what Mr. Sturtz just said. This was in the handout, but I can make another copy if anybody else would like the facility plan.

Mr. Sturtz: The preface to that is one or more of the following. It was a menu option.

Comm. Mimms: I have a few questions. With the community meeting that was had, I would like to see an exhaustive list of who is in that list. There are eight schools that are being affected. How many parents of students in these eight schools were stakeholders? Not just any parent. Someone from the community can be a parent, but I want to know if a parent from one of these schools was in that community meeting. I would like to see that list.

Mr. Sturtz: If I may just clarify a point. When we did the community process about the facilities master plan it was about the district. It was about everything. It was not about moving Main Street to Elm Street. That was not in the facilities master plan. The facilities master plan was do we need a new school here. If we do, what should we do with it? What kind of program should we have within it? Do we need boundary changes? Do we not need boundary changes? It wasn't down to the specific street level data. I can send you, and it should actually be on file already, who signed up registrations for all the community meetings. No problem. That's fine. I didn't want any misperception that people were sitting at those community meetings looking at Option 1 for the boundaries and Option 2 for the boundaries because that did not take place. They were looking at it from the facilities master plan, which was broader in scope.

Comm. Mimms: I understand that. I want it to be clear that when we make these decisions that we have to stop making assumptions based on what we want from a community perspective without the concerns of the parents of the children who will be affected by the decision. That's why I want to see the stakeholders from the community who were part of this facilities range plan. I know it was a broad scope from the beginning, but now we're getting into the generics. If parents are not involved and it affects their children, then that's a problem. With all that we're doing, with all the special education resource issues we have, will these schools provide everything that's required for all the IEPs that are currently in place and in the future for our special education children?

Mr. Sturtz: We were even looking this afternoon at what schools currently receive bussed students for special education for whatever reason and then looking and considering that in our transfer rates to make sure that a school had room. I can't remember how many students went in there, but we went down the list and made sure that worked. So the utilization numbers that you see for our recommended option, that move of Newcomer to School 16, accounts for those students.

Comm. Mimms: I'm to believe that all of our special education resource and IEP issues are cared for and they will be taken care of in this new school. We have some serious special education concerns here.

Comm. Irving: Do me a favor. Yes or no? We're trying to move this along. Yes or no?

Mr. Sturtz: Yes.

Comm. Irving: Thank you.

Mr. Sturtz: Not all of your schools have bussed special education. We looked at bussed. The reason I clarify this point is that we're moving kids out of their boundary to another one into that school.

Comm. Irving: But the answer is yes.

Mr. Sturtz: The answer is yes.

Comm. Irving: Thank you so much. What else do you have?

Comm. Mimms: I'm going to take my time. I don't want to be rushed because our students will be affected by these decisions. What is our strategy for transportation to ensure that our children will have proper pickup, drop-off, making sure there are aides, and all the availability that's needed.

Mr. Sturtz: I'm going to defer to your transportation director. We did sit down with her and we showed her all the options today. She's aware of them.

Comm. Mimms: Once that's done, I would love to see that.

Comm. Irving: At some point in time Lisa, can you do a presentation following up with Comm. Mimms' request? I think the importance piece is once the boundaries are drawn and voted upon how will that affect how kids are transported throughout the district. I think we have to make a decision for what that's going to look like and then that will help inform how your operations will then be affected moving forward.

Comm. Hodges: I'm certainly deeply respectful of the wishes of the community. But we have financial impacts which may alter what programs we can have available in these schools. While the community might make choices, it's incumbent upon the Board to make informed decisions based upon not only the resources that we have but looking at the overall needs of the school district and what we're facing in terms of fiscal hardships. I just want to put that on the table. We're not going to dismiss or disregard the needs of the community, but sometimes there are things that we have to decide to do that may run contrary to what the community wants in short term.

Comm. Irving: Would it make sense for us to have a special hearing just on this issue to give the Board the opportunity to go back to vet the respective plans and maps, and be able to come up with the necessary questions? I'm not saying it isn't informed, but we're just getting the information now. We need to have a more informed conversation on what is here. There still needs to be adjustments and recommendations specifically for what programs go where. At that point in time we make it and if we feel comfortable we can make a decision that night and also hear from the public. I think that's the other piece, Comm. Mimms, to allow the public to comment, the communities that might be affected by the respective changes in those areas to address the Board before we make

a decision. Something of this magnitude that will affect the move of kids and families need to be vetted by us, but we also need to give our constituents the opportunity to come here and let us know what they think. Is that fair? I think it makes sense to do it while we're simultaneously having conversations about the budget. So it's apropos that as the budget gets constructed this conversation happens and one can leverage the other to be able to move forward.

Comm. Rivera: I'm not going to extend this, but I agree with Dr. Hodges. We have to do what's best for the district. But don't forget Dr. Evans, we sat together. One of the plans reflected something that you were going to do to make sure we save the district money. Part of that was closing one or two schools. Correct?

Dr. Evans: Yes.

Comm. Rivera: Just remember, I'm in finance.

Comm. Irving: Thank you very much.

Comm. Kerr: I don't think it's reasonable for a Commissioner to go to the Superintendent and make agreements to close schools without a broad discussion from this Board.

Comm. Irving: I have no clue what Comm. Rivera is talking about.

Comm. Kerr: It's not going to happen.

Comm. Rivera: Can I rephrase? Normally the process is when a Commissioner puts in a request it gets submitted to all of you. Knowing that we have a budget problem here I requested how much it would cost to operate some of these schools that are in bad shape. I was just looking at every possible scenario without hurting the staff here and affecting the services. We have a lot of schools that are not fully utilized and we have some that are overcrowded. It was just an idea. We all share ideas of things that we can do to save money on the budget and this is just one of many that I have proposed. That's it.

Comm. Kerr: Let the Board have that information.

Comm. Rivera: If you didn't get a copy, there was no intent. We were not going behind doors discussing any of this stuff. I submitted a request and it was sent to me one or two days ago.

Comm. Kerr: You just said you and Dr. Evans agreed.

Comm. Rivera: We had a discussion.

Comm. Irving: Let's not get into semantics, folks. The bottom line is the budget is going to be discussed tonight.

Comm. Kerr: Let me have that information, please.

Comm. Irving: We'll make sure the Board gets the information. Comm. Rivera, I think the comments you made were just in reference to the recommendation that you have and the information you requested from the Superintendent, which is now going to be shared with the Board tonight because you asked the Superintendent to share it with

the Board. The information you requested was going to be presented to the Board tonight.

NJDOE High-Performing Reward Schools

Dr. Evans: As you know, the NCLB waiver acquired by the New Jersey Department of Education from the USDOE has many provisions in it. One of them includes the identification of our schools reflective of performance of our schools on state testing that was in place then, which was NJASK and HSPA. It will continue to represent testing and my guess is PARCC will figure into it. I don't believe the Department of Education has made that move yet. Nonetheless, it resulted in schools across the state being identified as Priority Schools, Focus Schools, or Reward Schools. Priority Schools were among the lowest performing 5% across the state. Focus Schools were schools representative of subgroups within them having lower performance as reflective on NJASK and HSPA. In the high school it was graduation rate that determined whether or not it was going to be a Focus School. Reward Schools are the top performing schools across the state and I believe it's the top 5% across the state. We received very recently, within the past few days, notification that Paterson now includes a Reward School. One of our schools has just been identified as a Reward School. It's reflective of continuous growth and performance over the past two years and indeed the school will be awarded a \$50,000 award as a result. I'm going to call on Mr. Cozart and Ms. White to come to the mic and for Mr. Cozart to present the award.

Mr. David Cozart: Good evening, Commissioners. I have the esteemed honor and privilege to announce the following – Certificate of Achievement awarded to Paterson Public Schools Academy of Health Science HARP for attaining the district's first designation as a High-Performing Reward School by the New Jersey Department of Education awarded this, the 10th day of February 2016 to Ms. Kelly White and her staff at HARP Academy. Congratulations signed by Dr. Donnie Evans, State District Superintendent, and Mr. Christopher C. Irving, Paterson Board President. Congratulations!

Don Bosco/Paterson Catholic

Comm. Irving: Is Dr. Crescione coming back to talk about Don Bosco and Paterson Catholic?

Dr. Evans: Ms. Maria Santa is handling that.

Ms. Maria Santa: Good evening Commissioners and Mr. President. I believe you have this presentation already. There are several slides that are going to give you two options that we are preparing as we continue to move forward with the plan to relocate Don Bosco to Paterson Catholic. It is coming around. It is a very brief presentation. My last presentation before you was concerning the plan that we had in place, step by step what was going to happen to relocate Don Bosco to Paterson Catholic. The options before you today are the result of what would happen as we relocate Paterson Catholic and the possible impact it may have in the schools in that vicinity as students would possibly be added to the enrollment at Don Bosco as they move into Paterson Catholic.

Comm. Irving: Do we have this in front of us?

Ms. Santa: Yes, you have it in front of you. Option number one would include Schools 27 and School 5. As you all know, both of those schools already send students to Don

Bosco. School 27 sends all of their 8th grade and School 5 is sending all of their 8th, 7th, and a large group of their 6th grade but not all of the 6th graders yet. If School 27 was to send all their grade seven to Don Bosco, which is currently 95 students, we're talking about the incoming 7th grade, we looked at the enrollment in the current 6th grade which would be the incoming 7th. That would be 95 students. It's a total of five classrooms. Then those five classrooms would be gained at School 27 to take pre-k classes from St. Mary's. In doing this, School 27 becomes a pre-k through 6th grade school. School 5 could send all of the 6th grade to Don Bosco, which is approximately 100 students, five sections. They would gain five classrooms. Two classrooms could be used to bring back the students that travel to kindergarten at Dale Avenue from School 5 every day on a bus and three classrooms could become pre-k rooms coming from St. Mary's Early Learning Center. In doing this the district gains three eight pre-k classrooms and the enrollment at Paterson Catholic coming from Don Bosco factoring in these added students from School 27 and School 5 would be at 808. We do know that Don Bosco currently has an enrollment of about 608 students and then we're adding about 200 more going into Paterson Catholic, which can take up to 900 students. You see St. Mary's now for the first time here because that is a lease that we currently have with the district. It would be a cost saving measure if we are able to release that lease and place the pre-k classrooms within our existing schools as we make these moves. Option 2 involves the schools that I just mentioned, but also School 19. School 27 would still send all of their 7th grade to Don Bosco, the five sections. They would take two grade 2 sections, one grade 3 section, and one grade 4 section from School 19 for a total of four classes coming from School 19. This would leave School 27 with one additional classroom to perhaps add a special education pre-k or a special education self-contained class in another grade. School 5 would send all of their 6th grade to Don Bosco, five sections. They would take one second grade from School 19, two grade 3 and two grade 4 classes. Then this would allow School 19 to become a pre-k through 1 school with a classroom for pre-k students. It would allow School 19 to bring back the class that goes to MLK for kindergarten every morning on a bus. That means we would gain nine classrooms, one to bring back that class and eight to become pre-k coming from St. Mary's Early Learning Center. The only concern with Option 2 would be that School 5 would not be able to bring back the kindergarten classes that go to Dale Avenue. The enrollment would be at 808 at Paterson Catholic for Don Bosco in doing this as well. These are options for your consideration. No final decision has been made. It is for you to look at the possibilities and for you to express any questions or concerns around these two options.

Comm. Redmon: You said the pre-k classes coming from St. Mary's are going to be a two-year process because we're going to be moving back to the new Don Bosco when it's rebuilt. Will those students be returning to the new Don Bosco when they go back to the new building?

Ms. Santa: You're talking about the pre-k classes that will then be housed at School 5 and...

Comm. Redmon: On your Option 1 your concern was the pre-k classes that were coming from St. Mary's and School 5 that would be housed at the Paterson Catholic.

Ms. Santa: The pre-k wouldn't go to Paterson Catholic. Paterson Catholic would be housing students in 6-8 from both School 5 and School 27. They already house students 6-8 from those schools. We would just be adding more students to free up space at School 5 and School 27 to take pre-k classes at those two schools.

Comm. Redmon: When the new school comes back on Union Avenue.

Ms. Santa: Maybe I'm not understanding you correctly. Is the question then as we build the new Don Bosco will it include pre-k in it?

Comm. Redmon: Yes.

Ms. Santa: I do not think so. I don't know the specifics yet, but I think it's not intended to include pre-k.

Comm. Irving: The new building is slated to be a middle school.

Dr. Evans: That's correct.

Comm. Irving: It's the same population that we'll have at Paterson Catholic will move once their new building comes and they will go back to their neighborhood building, which will be in their area.

Dr. Evans: That building has a capacity of almost 900.

Ms. Santa: The new building will be 900. St. Mary's services that community. The pre-k that's housed at St. Mary's eventually goes to kindergarten at both School 5 and School 27 and perhaps School 19. They would be funneling through those schools in the area anyway with the new Don Bosco as a middle school.

Comm. Mimms: I want to commend you on the progression timeline that you provided with the shifting of the schools. You should be commended because we don't really have to ask a lot of questions. You have it very detailed. I want to openly commend you for this great job that you've done in every presentation that you've presented to the Board.

Ms. Santa: Thank you. I must say that the work that we present before you is never done by one person. Behind this work there's a lot of collaboration that happens. There's a lot of leadership from those that work with us day in and day out. Thank you very much, but I must recognize that it involves others behind me. Thank you.

Comm. Mimms: Commendation to them all.

Comm. Irving: Can I ask that at that special meeting that we do for Hani Awadallah and School 15 that Options 1 and 2 be on the agenda for us to discuss and vote on as well. It probably makes sense just to nail both down if we can and be able to move. I assume once this is done, as you presented before, whatever the options are for boundaries there's going to be an expected action plan to inform the respective families, communities, and schools who will be impacted by it. You already have one for this, which I'm excited to know it's in the hopper. But the other options as they're developed will certainly require some level of plan of action to inform folks in the community. It also might be good at that hearing just to make sure we invite the families from School 27 and School 5 to attend the hearing as well to see if they have any questions. Again, it's just transparency and trying to make sure folks know what's happening and what's going on.

Ms. Santa: Absolutely. Thank you.

Comm. Irving: Thank you.

STATUS OF THE 2016-2017 SCHOOL DISTRICT BUDGET

Comm. Irving: I want to thank everyone in the back for being so patient. Let's talk about the budget.

Dr. Evans: Sure. Each Board member should have before them three pages that I lifted from the PowerPoint that I shared with you in the workshop meeting almost a month ago. We talked about budget priorities. The Board shared with us and gave us feedback on those priorities. We shared with you a brainstormed list of potential budget reduction strategies as well. In just a moment I'm going to ask Ms. Ayala the total gap that we are seeking to fill for next year. That's a short answer question if she knows what it is. Filling that gap for the coming year is our major task. We are not anticipating an increase in funds. In fact, we've been advised that flat funding was the most likely scenario and that's what we needed to plan for. If perchance we were to benefit from additional funding then obviously we can pull back some of the things that we may have adjusted. The priorities and goals are listed there. I added one based on the comments made from the Board and then following that are two pages that represent potential reductions. I underscored "potential." This is an extension of a brainstormed list. You saw an earlier version that had much of what's on it in terms of strategies. We continue to benefit from conversation with some of you on some strategies we may want to think about. We've had a couple of conversations in my Cabinet on this issue and additional potential strategies surfaced there as well. We've done some preliminary costing out of those strategies. You see a total represented on the second page if indeed we found ourselves in a situation where we had to reduce and this became the list that we reduced. Again, no decision has been made. This may not be the list. It may be something totally different, but this is a starting point for this discussion. Mr. President, I'd like for Daisy to come forward and tell us what that gap is now we're trying to fill, the total gap, based on what we know already from information from the Department of Education as well as our own books.

Ms. Daisy Ayala: Good evening, Commissioners. We know we're flat funded so we know what our revenues are. We know the expenditures because we actually know what's essential to the operating of the district. We have captured salaries, health benefits, liability insurance, and things of that nature that are essential to the operation of the district. With that being said, we had approximately a \$45 million gap. All of the budgets from the Cabinet have not come in. They're small amounts. The schools are all in. We've captured all of that and of course the teachers' salaries. If we have a \$45 million gap and with some of the savings that are going to impact we look like we're pretty good, but we still have to look and see the budgets that are coming in now.

Dr. Evans: Thank you, Daisy. This list of potential strategies totals \$53.7 million. Again, it may end up being less that we need. Based on what Daisy just said this is more than we need, but we may end up needing less. The Board may so no. We may have to find some other things to cut. We offer this to start the discussion.

Comm. Irving: Am I to assume that the recommendations you have here at some point in time will be followed up with some specifics?

Dr. Evans: Yes.

Comm. Irving: Case in point, when we talk about maintenance, security, transportation for how we're going to get a reduction of \$2 million, the figures are good, but we're all going to want to be able to drill down at some point and figure out exactly what this means for us.

Dr. Evans: We actually have that information. We didn't make these numbers up. There is documentation to show what these numbers mean. However, for that discussion we will need to do it in executive session.

Comm. Irving: I assume some of it refers to leases and personnel.

Dr. Evans: Exactly. There are items included that would require that this be a confidential discussion - some of it, not all of it.

Comm. Kerr: I'm interested in the first line item here.

Dr. Evans: The fund balance?

Comm. Kerr: The building fund balance for \$15 million.

Dr. Evans: Actually, I don't think we're building. I think we might already have it. Ms. Ayala? We've talked about the fund balance. I didn't indicate the total potential. Because we're talking potential I didn't want to go for the total that we initially talked about. What we have in place now and what we're fairly certain about is the amount. I've represented \$15 million and that's what Comm. Kerr is questioning.

Ms. Ayala: We currently have \$11 million. My last projection for this year end was about \$4 million that we're not going to spend. However, we actually have approximately \$17 million of available balance, which means that our staff has that encumbered. A memo went out yesterday or the day before saying if that's what's available it's obvious that you don't need the funding. If they don't need the funding then obviously we'll have more money for our fund balance. But it all depends on the staff encumbering what they think the needs are.

Dr. Evans: What we are certain of at this point is the \$4 million plus \$11 million.

Comm. Irving: When will you know for sure what that number will be? That's the biggest domino that affects everything else.

Comm. Kerr: Exactly.

Ms. Ayala: We are waiting for staff because it involves a lot of staff to get back to us.

Comm. Irving: So do we have a timeline? This Board still has to make the decision.

Ms. Ayala: By Friday.

Comm. Irving: Okay. That's reasonable. So by the next Board meeting if we do an executive session and the Board can be presented with the draw down options that are not public and confidential, I'm sure you'll be able to come back and adjust.

Ms. Ayala: Absolutely. We're waiting for their feedback. The memo is very clear that if we don't hear from you it means that the funds are available to us to support next year's budget.

Comm. Irving: I'm hoping with all the principals in the audience...

Ms. Ayala: I've encumbered all their funds. They're an exception to rule because they have graduation and field trips.

Comm. Irving: So you're really talking about central office staff.

Ms. Ayala: Yes. Schools are only \$1.6 million and that's not part of my \$17 million.

Comm. Irving: Fantastic.

Comm. Rivera: I know we could have done this. I know we had a discussion before. I was always positive. It could be done. We just have to look at this budget. I didn't have much input, but it's here presented to us. I know we're still going to discuss it. Some of the areas I'm seeing here are pretty close. They're actually more conservative than what I thought. I just want to thank you very much.

Comm. Hodges: My question isn't really going to be for Daisy. I'm looking at these wonderful strategies of saving money. Dr. Evans, what percentage of our third graders is reading on grade level?

Dr. Evans: That's a figure right now that we can't really count on because the data is PARCC. We were told not to over interpret that data because of all the variables. It's the first time the youngsters are taking it. They're using technology for the first time to take a high stakes test. We have figures that we can share, but other than use that as a baseline for teachers to disaggregate that data, get inside of it, analyze it, and determine the concepts and skills that they need to work on and do more work with their students, it's difficult to answer your question in the way that you're asking it.

Comm. Hodges: Let me put it this way. For the last year that you have data that you're comfortable with using, what was the percentage of kids who were reading on grade level at third grade?

Dr. Evans: About a third.

Comm. Hodges: A third of the total third grade. What percentage of high school students are graduating from high school via the last data we have available for HSPA?

Dr. Evans: I'd have to go back and look at the figures.

Comm. Hodges: How many schools do we have that are graduating over 50% of their students via the HSPA?

Dr. Evans: I'd have to pull that data.

Comm. Hodges: It was no more than three. The reason I'm raising these questions is because I don't see room to cut anything. I'm very distressed by this list here because the real issue is we're supposed to respond to needs. This is not a response to the needs here, not in any shape or form. No way. I know the position that you're in, but I am not in that position. This is a disgrace to me when you look at what we have educationally. I cannot accept this. I know you have to, but I don't. We cannot afford to sit here and have these cuts. We can't do it, not when you have a third of your kids able to read from what you can tell me. It goes on and on. I know we have a 78% graduation rate, but some schools have 38% of our kids graduating by HSPA and the rest graduating by alternative means. This means we're not doing what we're supposed to do. What's happening is our progress is plateauing educationally just as the funding

is. If we stand here and pretend that we can go ahead and make these stupid cuts what happens to the education? We don't have a curriculum in place. Who's going to do that? Where do you get the money to do it if we pretend that there's not a crisis in front of us? This is outrageous. I'm sitting here looking at this material and I'm saying to myself you have to be kidding me. There has to be a clarion call that we can't exist this way. If you can't make it, then by god we have to. I don't care what we're supposed to do. PARCC is showing us because the other schools have the same baseline and we are far below them and next year won't be any better because they're going to improve too. I can't sit here and be sanguine about making cuts here and cuts there when the real challenge lies in how do we respond to where our kids are educationally and we're not doing it to the degree that we have to. Not by a long shot. It will get worse next year. We have programs that these principals can't employ because they can't afford to do it. We don't teach to any efficient degree electricity and magnetism in the Paterson School District at all. We don't do it. Think about that. Electricity and magnetism isn't being taught here. It is over there in Hawthorne. It is in Elmwood Park, but not in Paterson. And we're sitting here talking about making cuts? This is an exercise in futility and if we sit here and say to the state that we have all these so-called funds to cut, do you know what happens next year? We have a three-year audit projection which says in 2018 we'll be facing a \$186 million deficit, which we are helping to create. We don't have art and music. If you don't have elementary school music students, what happens to high school students down the line? Where's your band coming from? Where's your choir coming from? By the way, art and music teach students how to interpret problems differently. If I'm wrong, have some of those people up there tell me that I'm wrong. I'm sitting here saying this is ridiculous. To even have this conversation is an insult to the time that I've spent on this Board. I'm sorry.

Comm. Rivera: I know we're going to discuss this later and we're going to get into detail to see who's going to be affected. These are just numbers that are being presented to us today. If we're going to anticipate the sale of property in the budget let's make sure we have a contract that we're actually going to sell this property. With the \$5 million we have there let's make sure we have a contract before we put this in the budget because the state shouldn't even allow us to anticipate this money without a contract. You don't want to plug something in there so we can tell the public that we balanced the budget when we actually didn't because we will start at a shortfall of \$5 million. I want to see the details for transportation. I think that number is actually a little conservative. Given how much money we have spent after we hired that company I think that number is a little conservative. I think we might have a bigger savings if we do some changes.

Dr. Evans: It is conservative.

Comm. Rivera: It is very conservative. You always have room. If we look at that line we might be able to increase that one a little in anticipation of the reduction there and put some money back in another area if need be. Again, we're going to have that discussion later on. I just want to point those things out.

Comm. Kerr: Looking at this that \$5 million for selling property should not even be considered in the 2015-2016 budget. There's no way we would be able to make that a reality. Absolutely no way! Putting it here is a waste of time.

Comm. Rivera: Actually, state law allows you to put it there if you already have a contract in place.

Comm. Kerr: We don't. You just said unless we know that we have a contract to sell that property we should not include it in the budget. I'm just saying what you have said.

I'm saying there's absolutely no way we're going to get a contract between now and the completion of this budget. We should not even be looking at that number as part of that reduction effort. It should not be. We're trying to throw things together here and build this number up to make it look good. We need to be realistic.

Comm. Rivera: I agree, but let's just give the administration the benefit of the doubt. They put it in this document and I'm sure they have a plan. Let's just hear what they have and we're going to ask those questions when we sit down with the administration to ask them if we can get a contract in place by the time this budget is submitted. Remember, a budget is just a plan. It could change. You just put some things down that we might be able to do. If they're not doable then we're going to have to start over again.

Comm. Kerr: When are we going to be expected to vote on this budget? When is it being presented?

Dr. Evans: The first week in March.

Comm. Kerr: And you're telling me that between now and the first week in March we will have documents set up selling a building for \$5 million to affect this number.

Comm. Irving: Remember, that's their job to figure out. Let's just be optimistic. Maybe it will. It just might.

Dr. Evans: We actually had a party interested in purchasing one of our facilities and we pulled back when we learned we couldn't keep the money. Now we can keep the money. So we need to go back to that party to determine if they're still interested. There are possibilities. We didn't put it on there just to put it on there.

Comm. Kerr: Okay.

Comm. Irving: Dr. Hodges has a great point. It's a bigger point about the underfunding of our district.

Comm. Hodges: Illegal underfunding.

Comm. Irving: What is happening is not just to us, but to almost every urban district in the State of New Jersey. I got an email from Assemblyman Wimberly this morning and it looked at an appropriation for the state aid that should be allocated under the School Finance Reform Act compared to what we've been given. While on one hand I absolutely agree with you and concur, the other side of me that is practical says that on some level we still have to balance this budget and we have to have a conversation about these issues. While I know it ticks many of us off, the state has ponied up their fair share I don't see them ponying up their fair share in this current administration. So we have to do our due diligence nonetheless to still vet this budget and to limit the hemorrhaging as much as possible. I'm not content with leaving it solely up to the administration to make that decision without this Board having the final say and conversation about what's going to happen fiscally.

Comm. Hodges: With all due respect, neither am I, but I'm also looking at the educational side of it. This is an Abbott district. Even though we're no longer called an Abbott district, the budget is supposed to be based on our needs. To say that we don't have needs, which is what we're implying, undermines what we have to do educationally for our students. We don't have a curriculum in place, for god sakes.

We're a year and a half from getting one. What that means is you can't put together strategies, know the cost for those strategies, or even make adequate plans without funding. So when you sit there talking about just balancing the budget, you can't really do that until you clearly establish what your needs are going to be educationally. You can't. You have a whole curriculum to write. You have science to redo totally from the bottom up. Your biology students have passed the end-of-year test at a 15% rate. Last year it was 18% and now it's down to 15%. Biology for god sakes! My concern is to pretend that there's not an educational cost to, as you said, responsibly balancing the budget is putting our heads in the sand. Unless we talk about what we actually need to service those kids then this is an exercise in futility because we're not here to balance the budget. We're here to educate children and the state is supposed to supply us with our financial needs to do that job. There are Board members here who said we have been plateauing in terms of academic production. I don't want to be redundant, but we're plateauing and some part of that is because of the money we're allowed to spend.

Comm. Irving: Or the money we're not getting. You and I agree in that regard. But as far as I stand, we still have a fiscal responsibility to ensure the quality of education for the kids in this city and still balance that budget. I just want to make it very clear that we as a Board have to and need to be involved in this conversation. What's being presented to us has to be vetted by this group and there needs to be a discussion around it. I'm being very frank, Dr. Hodges. While I think you're absolutely right, I do not see this Governor and this Commissioner and this administration coming off any additional funds even when our current legislators have tried to do so. So I have to go back and say we still have to do the best we can with what we have because these folks are not giving us anything more.

Comm. Hodges: You have to establish what your actual needs are and the real consequences for not having those needs met.

Comm. Irving: That's a fair statement.

Comm. Hodges: Then your budget becomes an exercise of you've given us this and this is going to be the real time cost of not being able to provide those resources. We cannot follow the mandates of providing a thorough and efficient education for our students. If our kids can't read at third grade, then we're not providing a thorough and efficient education for them. If we cut the funds that should go to developing programs and approaches to addressing those needs, then we're not going to get any closer to doing what we're supposed to do by law.

Comm. Irving: I think in all fairness to the Superintendent and the administration, you all need to be able to justify to us how this budget is going to be implemented and is not going to affect teaching, learning, and instructional program. If it is, you need to explain that and figure out what exactly that is going to mean for us going forward. I think that presentation at the next Board meeting and/or executive session needs to be reflected at that point in time. To answer your question even more directly, Dr. Hodges, we're going to take a recess after we're done with this discussion. I think that conversation next about the Board's priorities should help drive that process.

Comm. Kerr: Here's my issue. We look at the recommendation that the administration presents here. Say we accommodate everything that's here in the 2016-2017 budget. What do we do for the 2017-2018 budget? We will have the same exact issues popping up. We'll have to finance the budget. We are not going to get any more. What do we do? Repeat the same exercise that we have here?

Dr. Evans: Are you asking me?

Comm. Kerr: Yes.

Dr. Evans: I don't have an answer for that question. My charge right now is to develop a balanced budget for the 2016-2017 school year.

Comm. Irving: But I do think Comm. Kerr has an excellent point. Once this 2016-2017 budget is effectively prepared there has to be an exercise put in place immediately. You and I have had a sidebar about this to have a long-term financial plan for the district for what the next two years will look like for this district financially. You're right. We haven't seen the tip of the iceberg as far as what this cliff is. Next year we're supposed to hit it extremely hard. If that's the case, at least we give our legislators a year in advance to lobby and argue. We can go down and be able to justify and say we're not going to be able to provide anything in this district. If you're talking about reducing district staff and not touching schools you'll have schools that are fully staffed but there won't be anybody here. There are pros and cons. Responsibly we have to commit this exercise and balance this budget, but I'm more concerned with us being able to figure this out and not touch schools. What do we do in the next year and the year after that? I think that plan needs to be presented to the Board as soon as we adopt the budget in March. Sometime in April there needs to be another budget projection and plan for what we're going to do in the next fiscal year.

Comm. Kerr: Do we expect any fallout from adopting this budget? Do we expect any fallout in terms of the district's ability to deliver quality education within the next year?

Dr. Evans: I think it's too soon to answer that question. I have to see ultimately what is cut. This is a potential list. This is not the final list.

Comm. Irving: Dr. Evans, I think you need to present the specifics at the next meeting. The good part is that the agenda for the regular meeting is not long at all. It's like 20 action items. I think we need to spend some very significant time discussing. The only presentation we have should be the budget, the action items that need to be presented, and the executive session. So you can clearly go through line by line specifically what these items are, if there are specifics to them, pinpoint what they are, and then do the executive session to pinpoint what other elements we can't discuss in public.

Dr. Evans: Sure.

Comm. Hodges: If you do all of this, does that address having to hire staff to rewrite the curriculum? In addition to that, does it address professional development of the teaching staff to handle the new curriculum that you've put in place assuming that you can afford to pay for it? Does it address the new equipment that's going to be utilized in the classroom for science, math, and coding should that dream ever happen? Does it address that? Or does it hold us where we are in order to pass this budget? You're just saying we want to get level to close this \$45 million gap. But once you're there, what happens to the other side of this equation, which is the educational part? We're frozen in time.

Comm. Irving: If you present a much more detailed version of this budget to the Board...I'm going to interpret what you're saying through my own purview. This Board has to have unadulterated confidence that even in the midst of going through this exercise we will still be able to give the kids of this city the best and quality education possible. How can you do that if you have a reduction? For you to explain that and

make it very clear how these cuts don't directly impact teaching quality and learning is going to be really important.

Comm. Hodges: It's not just impact. We can't impact. It's not enough. Impact says you can't go backwards. We're not wishing to go backwards. We have to go ahead. What I'm saying to you is this is not a question of just staying static. We need funds to go ahead, to catch up. You just can't simply say we're going to close the budget hole. We need to know how we get from where we are with one third of our kids being able to read at a third grade level to roughly half of our students at the high school level graduating through the HSPA or whatever mechanism we come up with in the future to where we're supposed to be. If you don't have any more money but you're just staying where you are, you can't get there. You're stuck. Looking at those test scores even though they're just a baseline, but they're a poor baseline, I can't be stuck and say I'm happy about it and be satisfied. My job is not to cut the budget. My job is to improve education.

Comm. Kerr: You can't kill the future.

Comm. Rivera: I agree with everything you said, Dr. Hodges. I understand we need a lot of things here. As Chris stated before, we have to present a balanced budget. A budget is a plan of services he's going to provide. This is not a budget. These are just areas where he's saying that we might be able to cut. He's not saying that this finalized. This is not the budget. I know what you're saying. We have to show the state that the district has needs. But this is not the instrument to do it. This is a budget. For every dollar we spend we have to have a dollar of revenue coming in. It would do a disservice, now that we have local control in the area of finance, to submit a budget that's not balanced. They wouldn't even look at it. They would look at the revenue section and the appropriations, which are your proposed expenditures, and they wouldn't even look at it. They would send it back to the Superintendent to redo the budget because he submitted a budget that's not balanced. I don't think Daisy is going to sign a budget that's not balanced.

Ms. Ayala: The system will not allow you.

Comm. Rivera: The system will not allow you.

Comm. Hodges: Mr. Rivera, please don't think for one second that I don't understand that. The point I'm trying to make to you is that it's not adequate to simply produce a current budget. You have to have some understanding of how you move forward. What you're doing right now is simply reducing the whole that you have. That's all I'm saying. I know what you're talking about.

Comm. Kerr: My interpretation of what Dr. Hodges is saying is when you present the budget you should know what that budget can produce. That's the point. It's not just matching and balancing numbers. We know that has to be, but by reducing the budget by that amount of money what do we get out of it?

Comm. Hodges: What's going to be hit?

Comm. Irving: At this point in time, since we know we're going to have a conversation about the budget on the 17th, can I just get a motion to take a 10-minute recess to allow our faculty to leave and then we'll reconvene in 10 minutes?

The Board took recess at 8:04 p.m.

The Board reconvened the meeting at 8:19 p.m.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

It was moved by Comm. Cleaves, seconded by Comm. Castillo that the Public Comments portion of the meeting be opened. On roll call all members voted in the affirmative. The motion carried.

Ms. Rosie Grant: Good evening. Thank you, sir.

Comm. Irving: The Vice President said you can have six minutes tonight.

Ms. Grant: Six minutes! Good, because I have a lot to say. I will not let this budget discussion steal my joy. This is an awesome day for education in Paterson, getting back control of two areas. We've been at this for 24 years and so let's celebrate it as we push forward. Dr. Evans gave a great report today. Thank you. They were still talking about it after you left. And thanks to both of you for acknowledging the parent and community advocacy over the years. It was rewarding because we had parents and community members in the audience and they felt good about being acknowledged. I'm listening to this budget. Well, let me say congratulations to HARP as well and to all of you for getting this designation for HARP Academy. That's also phenomenal news for us. The budget discussion - we're talking about redistricting and perhaps closing schools and cutting costs and as you do that I want to caution you to remember the human factor. Someone did mention about how it affects the kids. Please keep the child at the center of all these discussions and know we have to balance the budget, but we need to remember that we're here to serve the needs of our children in Paterson. Imagine an 8th grade student who is suddenly told you have to go to that school because we're redistricting. So please do keep families and children in mind as you do have this discussion. After you left, Dr. Evans, they did show some of the PARCC data and sadly the conversation at the State Board turned to our 36% score in instruction and program on the PARCC and how that relates to how kids are performing. Couple that with a \$45 million budget gap. This is a serious issue that we have to tackle. We have no music teachers, librarians, or art teachers in many of our schools. Kids are not getting what they need and will never get back instruction and program until we get that 36% score up. So here we are arguing about where to spend and what to cut when the state owes us \$70 million and counting. So I fully understand the need to balance a budget, but I think there's also a need for us, for this elected body and for us as the community, to demand the money that the state owes us. Regardless of who is our Governor and what his feelings are about the public schools, and we know them well, the law is the law and we cannot continue to allow the State Department of Education to ignore the law. So I'm challenging you as our Board. Take them to court. Join in the advocacy. Keep pressing forward. Take the DOE to court. You're an elected body in this community. They are not going to give us instruction and program for a while, so you don't have to worry about them being mad at us. Take them to court. Let's get the money to do what we need to do for our kids. Thanks.

It was moved by Comm. Cleaves, seconded by Comm. Mimms that the Public Comments portion of the meeting be closed. On roll call all members voted in the affirmative. The motion carried.

DISCUSSION OF BOARD GOALS AND PRIORITIES FOR THE 2016-2017 SCHOOL YEAR BUDGET

Comm. Irving: Let's get to discussion of Board goals and priorities for the school year and budget. I was talking to Comm. Cleaves and I want to frame this conversation and ultimately see if we can really agree and come down to a few items. But in past years, I know we have normally given the Superintendent a list of different strategies and recommendations, and as the years go by it never happens. My hope would be that if we're going to have a conversation about goals and priorities, are there three to four specific priorities which we can identify that we can all agree to and subsequently hold the Superintendent accountable? Dr. Hodges brought up an amazing point a second ago. I'm agreeing with you a lot tonight, John, and I don't understand.

Comm. Hodges: You're getting older.

Comm. Irving: The curriculum map and the curriculum design to me is a priority. That to me is something that needs to be a priority of this district and we need to see over the course of the next 12 months or so progress for how this district plans to incorporate and get that done. To say that we're a year and a half away it should not take that long for us to get there. And we have the capacity and/or we can afford the capacity and the resources to get it done. But then again that has to be reflected in the budget. All I'm saying is that I want to have a good discussion, but let's try to see if we can nail three to four specific tangible items to hold this Superintendent and that staff accountable for. So I want to open the floor for discussions and thoughts on what we want to see. Let's try to document that and then have a conversation with how best we narrow it. Dr. Hodges, your thought?

Comm. Hodges: The only problem I have with that is if you look at the overall problem, we know that language arts is critical because it's not that we're not teaching children how to read, we are doing that, but they're not reading well. And if they're not reading well and their vocabulary isn't expanded, then science and social studies and even math is more of a problem for us to teach. If you look at where we are educationally, we're not closing that gap in the early childhood region, which is preschool to 3rd grade if you will. So something has to be done to create a plan to do that and that's not just writing curriculum. That's also looking at outreach to parents and finding ways to train parents to get closer involved with helping their kids read and helping to try to find ways to expand the children's vocabulary. You have to get at least that level improved. If you don't have that then you're going to be forever chasing poor performance from that day onward, because the kids coming in on the ground floor aren't where they're supposed to be. So you never get to catch the ones at the top. Never!

Comm. Irving: I just want to make sure that I wrote this. So you're talking about the creation of a comprehensive plan to close the language arts gap between preschool and three?

Comm. Hodges: Yes, in language arts. That entails a number of different areas. That's why I'm a little uncomfortable with your original premise about the priorities. The scope of that is a lot larger than it may appear on the surface.

Comm. Irving: Right, but I think if that is one of three or four respective items that we agree on, I think the impact for what that can do for us, short and long term, has greater opportunity for us to be able to vet and roll out in the four coming years.

Comm. Hodges: Right. If you manage to get success there, then some of that is translatable to the later grades.

Comm. Irving: But, nonetheless, something like that would then have to be communicated to the Superintendent and then reflected in the budget for how we are going to implement that process. I appreciate that. Are there any other thoughts and ideas? I'm going to bring up the curriculum and the curriculum map, and having the mapping done. We've been at this I think far too long and we keep getting killed on QSAC. I don't know how many points on instruction and program it is, but right now in I&P we're at 32. That's almost 15 and 20 points on QSAC and it's our curriculum. How can we expect teachers and administrators to administrate educational pedagogy without having the road map to be able to deliver it?

Comm. Hodges: The problem with that is... Everything I have to say today is about curriculum - everything. The problem with that is, who's going to write it? You need personnel to write it.

Comm. Irving: We have to come up with the goals and it is the expectation for Dr. Evans to come back to us and tell us how he is going to implement that with this budget.

Comm. Hodges: Well, that's just it. Not to be redundant, what I needed first was a number that the curriculum department needed. Then based on what they need then tell me what your budget is going to be afterwards once you've made sure that you've taken care of that. If you don't have that number then this is ridiculous. This is meaningless to me because I need to know what they need financially to do the job that's ahead of them. If you don't have that answer... They may say we need \$20 million. You've closed the gap for \$45, but the real gap is \$65 and you haven't done anything about it. So I need that number from her, I need it from the science department, and I need it from the math department to come tell me what you need to be effective. And once you can tell me that, then I will know what this actually means. This doesn't mean anything to me. You can't sit there and tell me that you're focused on trying to get priorities when your discussion is precluded because you're starting from a zero.

Comm. Irving: I think that's a conversation that you all can vet and have in committee and hopefully Ms. Peron should be able to answer. So I guess the next time you all meet, Ms. Peron should be able to grab that. Comm. Mimms, I want to click on you for a second if you don't mind because you're the chair for family and community engagement. I'm wondering, are there any initiatives that you believe, in the brief time that your committee has had conversations, that we should be focusing on as a district?

Comm. Mimms: There are so many areas where it comes to engaging parents. And so I would like to see focus groups put in place where we can identify from parents why they're not coming, whether it's an anonymous box or maybe using Robo calling even more so to talk about different programs that we're offering and workshops that are happening on a more frequent basis. But if we send something anonymously to parents where they don't have to put their name on it to ask them why don't you come. And then we create a survey or develop a pilot group that will help us to identify what's lacking and what's needed. Then from that we can build to increase parent participation.

Comm. Irving: Can I add on that? I don't know if you all noticed it, but the Superintendent Jersey City presented. They conducted some type of assessment for parent satisfaction of district performance. I was just impressed. The response was actually really high, which baffles me. They had like a 30% or 40% response rate given the numbers she was sharing, which is not normally significant. To get a 10% to 15% response rate is normally within the margin of error. If we can put together an

assessment tool over the next year and spend time understanding or trying to capture from our parents what are the ways in which we're missing them and how do we best grab them. This should be vetted thoroughly through the committee, but there should be some tool created and maybe even a policy passed by this Board that helps to implement that tool every three years or so that assesses parent satisfaction with their schools, with the teaching and learning of their kids, what they expect to find, and what services they expect from Full Service Community Schools. We might be able to get some really good data to be able to do this. Dr. Evans, to me that's what I think educational institutions like Seton Hall and William Paterson could be used for. You use consultants for a one-shot opportunity to capture information and report that information back to us. I always get frustrated when I see the redundancy of consultants from certain universities over and over again. I'm saying to myself that's not the point of having a consultant. You have a consultant to fill a gap capacity. They come in, fill that gap, they count to task, and then that person leaves and you take whatever is left from the information and move on.

Comm. Castillo: I guess just more to piggyback on it. One of the biggest reasons I think why we're missing our parents and we have to do more of an outreach is the language barrier. I think we as the Board especially in community outreach, how do we get those parents that don't have the tools or sometimes feel like they can't come to a place because they feel uneasy about it? We have a lot of young parents that aren't involved that should be involved that are from our district. How do we bring them back into the schools to help us out? A lot of those young parents just kind of feel pushed out.

Comm. Irving: Or had negative experiences when they were in school.

Comm. Castillo: Exactly.

Comm. Irving: I've heard that from folks in my age group all the time. Folks had bad experiences in a school system, not just Paterson, but it might have been a neighboring school system, and because of that they are much more hesitant to walk into a school building or to engage a principal for a whole host of reasons. Ms. Warren and Mr. Cozart, you all have seen it time and time again from being in the buildings.

Comm. Hodges: We had a survey instrument developed in 2006 out of the Parent Resource Center and you could score it...

Comm. Irving: Like a Scantron?

Comm. Hodges: Yes. The problem that resulted was with the distribution of it. Sometimes the principals were less than anxious to have those surveys given to parents if it might reflect an unhappy experience.

Comm. Irving: That's what I would hope, Dr. Evans. If we say the Board expects some level of assessment done I don't think it should be surveys. I love the idea of focus groups, a districtwide parent engagement involving implementation plans that looks at a mixed method approach to try to capture what our community needs. We're always well intentioned. I do believe that folks who work with Family and Community Engagement are well intentioned. But using data as we're using to help steer instruction also has to be done in order to help steer services. It's the same way we did with the Community School process. We surveyed the folks in the area. I just don't know when the last time was. You all can tell me. Was 2006 the last time we did a districtwide assessment?

Dr. Evans: No. Until 2011 or 2012, the year the RACs came in, we had developed and began implementing districtwide in all schools a culture survey that asked parents to respond. It was a satisfaction survey, but it was based on attributes of the culture of the school. Was the school inviting to them? Did the school involve them in activities? We did that for two consecutive years. The notebooks are full of those surveys upstairs and I have the results. The RACs came in and started doing the very same thing. They duplicated it and we tried to stop them and couldn't. Basically we were told we had to accept what they were doing at least in Priority and Focus Schools. We pulled back so parents weren't getting two surveys. That survey is tested and ready to use again, whether it's in a focus group or through some other venue. But we have the surveys and they've been research tested.

Comm. Mimms: Can we see what those questions look like? If it's a culture based survey we'll still miss the data that we're looking for. Culture would be a piece and maybe we can separate it into sections of culture, educational piece, engagement, success of students, or whatever the five areas are. Maybe we can section it to those different degrees and then it can be aligned with QSAC to help us with the scoring system.

Dr. Evans: When I say culture maybe we're saying the same thing. School culture is what we're talking about. One of those is obviously making sure that it's inviting and welcoming to the parents and involving them and those kinds of things.

Comm. Mimms: A piece I would like to add to that is the environmental culture. How does the environment affect the learning behavior and how does it impact the parental skills that are either missing or what's needed? Once I see it I'll be able to...

Dr. Evans: It's a good starting point. You may modify. You may decide something else might be better, but it's a good starting point and it's been researched.

Comm. Kerr: I agree that we should be doing the survey because I believe that we are failing to capture a great too many of our parents. It defies the law of probability. We're not even capturing 5% of our parents and that defies the law of probability. We need to do more in that regard, Dr. Evans. We have to design something that will reach out and try to capture more parents. I believe that if we get more parents to respond to us we will be able to do a better job in terms of delivering the education. They are the missing piece and I believe we just need to reach out some more to them.

Dr. Evans: For my notes, is the goal to increase parent involvement or is it around a specific strategy?

Comm. Irving: I think the goal is to engage in an assessment model for the purposes of helping to increase and influence parent engagement. I would say, and correct me if I'm wrong, Comm. Kerr and Comm. Mimms, but a mixed message assessment. That might take some time. It might take a four or five month period in which we target schools, such as high schools, middle, or even pre-k. You have very diverse district factor groups. Then you also conduct focus groups to be able to present to the Board and this district a comprehensive report that gives an outlook of family and community engagement from an educational, social, satisfaction, and community expectation standpoint, and what our parents are expecting of us as district leaders.

Comm. Kerr: I don't believe there is a parent in this district who would not accept a call from this district asking questions about helping to deliver the kind of education that

should be delivered. I don't believe there is one. I believe if we can find a way that we reach out to those parents we can do that.

Comm. Redmon: I think that we should focus on the curriculum base because I think a lot of parents don't really understand the curriculum that their students are coming home with. If we can focus on something with the curriculum teaching them what their students are going to be learning and how they can learn along with them. A lot of times our parents are not informed about our curriculum that we're teaching our students at this time.

Comm. Mimms: I think that's the educational sufficiency piece. Maybe that will be a workshop model where we can train the parents on testing and all those different areas. With the assessment it's kind of different because it's like high level and we want to define it so we can do needs based assessment. What Comm. Redmon is talking about are models and workshops, what we need to do as far as an educational piece on PARCC testing, how you help your child with homework to get to results, and different workshops that we need to provide. But for the assessment tool it needs to be high level but drilled specifically to the five areas of QSAC. It helps them, but it really helps us to balance that budget.

Comm. Irving: Can I bring one more thing up pertaining to facilities? Is Mr. Morlino still here? We're sitting here talking about potential goals for the Board for next year. Does the five-year facility plan take into account feasibility studies for all our buildings on what's working, what's not working, what needs to be repaired, or projected repairs?

Mr. Morlino: There was an assessment part of it. A facilities cost index was put into it. It's not in any great detail, but it does identify some of the infrastructure that needs to be replaced over time.

Comm. Irving: If we're going to take a hard look at and make decisions on what facilities get repaired and when, I think that's another area that needs to be drilled down. We need to be able to look at all 50 plus buildings and know that in this building the roof is going to go in 10 years.

Mr. Morlino: We just did that assessment on roofing in particular. We just assessed every roof in the district and we have a complete assessment which we are prioritizing right now. That report just came in.

Comm. Irving: Boilers?

Mr. Morlino: We know where the bad boilers are, but for a five or ten-year projection we need to do a more in-depth study.

Comm. Irving: There are districts that do that. They put together a comprehensive list of all the respective facilities and projected or proposed issues associated with them. I'm not getting to the cost of fixing them yet. Before you get there, you have to know comprehensively what you're facing for not just one or two years, but for the next five to ten-year period.

Mr. Morlino: Just from what I already know about the district without doing that in-depth analysis, we're looking at \$50 to \$100 million over the next five years just to maintain our physical plants, to keep them watertight, keep the boiler and heat on, and keep the lights going. It's one of the reasons we're looking at the ESIP program, to infuse some capital dollars from that cost savings of energy improvement methods. That's still in the

analysis stage at this point. That assessment looks at all that infrastructure - the boilers, the control systems, and lighting systems. All of that stuff is being looked at in the ESIP program so you'll have a good idea of what potentially can be obsolete in five years.

Comm. Irving: Okay. So that process is already moving. Here's what I have so far. We have a recommendation to finalize and to finish and then present to the Board the actual curriculum maps for all content areas affiliated with the Common Core. We've been at this now for three years. That's the question I have for you, T.J. If we finish the curriculum and aligned the mapping and had it done for QSAC, how many points does that give us for instruction and program?

Comm. Hodges: I guarantee it won't give you more than three for governance.

Mr. Theodore Best: In instruction and program curriculum is worth 25 out of 100 points.

Comm. Irving: Right now we're at 32 and if we were able to get the curriculum completed, aligned, and approved by the Board that would be an additional 25 points on top of the 32.

Mr. Best: Not automatically though.

Comm. Irving: Potentially we have the ability to add in another 25. We've been in the 30s over the last few visits. It would move us from the 20s to 30s, which is almost above 50%.

Mr. Best: There are nine questions related to curriculum and by not having all of the curriculum done you lose 25 points essentially. There's a potential that even if we did all of the curriculum, we still might not get all 25 points because some of it is also tied to curriculum and assessment.

Comm. Irving: Sure. Fair enough.

Comm. Hodges: He just mentioned the part that I was concerned about. It's not simply putting in place a curriculum. It's putting in place an effective curriculum that takes into account the expanded needs that PARCC is uncovering and, more importantly, the Common Core calls for. That's what I'm really interested in - finding a way to adopt that curriculum to the needs of the kids here and the challenges that we've experienced in terms of trying to teach these children. It's not just writing the curriculum. If they don't learn, you don't...

Comm. Irving: What's the point?

Comm. Hodges: Absolutely. It's a bigger piece than just give me the curriculum. I'll stop there.

Comm. Mimms: It's 25 points possibly and the target is 80. There's a 23-point differential. Is there a guideline? Are there target drivers that will help us gear or align ourselves to move towards that? Can we get a copy of that so we'll know the areas we can push to assure that even if we don't get that 25 cushion there are other areas where we can thrive so we can get that 80%?

Mr. Best: Unfortunately, even if we got everything else correct we probably won't get the 80 because 42 points are actually tied towards assessment directly. The

assessment measure is done by where the district compares to the state average. Everything is in comparison to the state average. Unless we meet the state average on those benchmarks, that's 42 points right off the top that unfortunately we won't be able to get.

Comm. Hodges: And that's our real purpose here.

Comm. Irving: Comm. Mimms, I'm going to ask Dr. Evans to share something that we just found out related to this. Dr. Hodges knows about the Commissioner mentioning a potential waiver for us for instruction and program.

Dr. Evans: Let me talk more globally first about the decision that the State Board made today and the next steps that are already under way. I spent the rest of the day following that meeting in Trenton meeting with the Commissioner and his staff over next steps. Part of the answer to the questions being asked is connected to those next steps. First of all, for the two areas, personnel and fiscal, transition plans are being developed. They're being drafted by one of the DOE's attorneys. The Board President is going to be invited to participate in that and I'm sure he'll engage the Board. That's being turned around pretty quickly, much faster than the last one. Part of that will then ultimately connect to next steps as it relates to I&P and governance. I&P is actually the big driver because the points we lost in governance were I&P points. So if we fix the I&P issues, we fix the governance issue. I think it was one issue for governance.

Mr. Best: Curriculum. Curriculum is double weighed in both instruction and program and governance. If we did get all of the curriculum up to date we will reach over 90 in governance.

Comm. Kerr: We still would not be getting governance.

Comm. Hodges: It's weighed logarithmically, so you'd only get three.

Dr. Evans: The point is it appears, and I say appears because the Commissioner can always change his mind or not approve what comes from what I'm about to say and I can't go that far in what I'm about to say, we are being charged with looking at some options for closing the gaps in I&P that are being discussed using alternative approaches particularly to the test scores. But we have to come up with them. They have to be defensible, research-based and ultimately have to yield results and not necessarily over an extended period of time. It could be a year when results may surface or less than that. Nonetheless, some research has to take place to determine what alternatives might the Commissioner accept as alternatives to what's there. He may say yes or he may say no, but we are being given that opportunity. I can't say any more than that at this time.

Comm. Irving: Let me just break down what Dr. Evans just said to make sure we're on the same page. I think folks at the State Department know if they are ever to return any of the local urban districts I&P test scores is going to be an area that – I'm not going to use the word impossible because that's a futile word and our job is to make everything possible for our kids – but they recognize it is going to be a long continued journey to bring us to the point to get where we are. So I think what the Commissioner and his staff are trying to say is if we have QSAC less the test scores, are there other elements that we can put in that if we get curriculum done the district will then create to be able to judge ourselves and be able to say in lieu of the test scores are there one or two other areas we can put in that if we accomplish that and we got reviewed in QSAC would then

return I&P to us all with the condition of a waiver. I know Jersey City and Newark are currently engaging in a conversation similar as this.

Dr. Evans: Jersey City was engaged in a conversation this afternoon. I spent a good amount of time listening to their waiver, what they were doing, how they were doing it, and learning. Then ultimately the decision is on us in terms of how we may want to approach it.

Comm. Irving: Again, my intention is, as opposed to what happened in Newark, that this Board is actively engaged in the process for helping to create what those measures are and that other members of the community who have been key stakeholders with us for a very long time also be engaged. Our structure is very different than the structure they have in Newark and Jersey City. It's equally important that the Board and the Superintendent collaboratively are the ones really spearheading this and leading this initiative. Dr. Evans has assured me of that and I know when he went to his conversation today he reemphasized that to the folks in the State Department that what works in Newark and Jersey City is not going to work in Paterson.

Dr. Evans: Correct.

Comm. Irving: I have three items. Is there anything else as far as goals?

Comm. Hodges: I just want to make sure that when I ask for the number, there's some talk here about possibly having to cut administrators and things, which I overheard the conversation with the press. Some of you haven't heard that. I think it was mentioned at the last meeting that we've cut from central office.

Dr. Evans: Correct.

Comm. Hodges: That number has to include the staff to do it and the professional development of the teachers and whatever entity is going to do that training so that they can implement the curriculum. That's all part of whatever number is being given regarding the curriculum. That's extremely important. You can't contract extracurricular activities. You simply can't because the school environment is enhanced, not to mention the usage of the material that students learn during those extracurricular events. When our kids apply to college they can say they played football, basketball, and they used to be able to say they play in a band. You go to some of these other places and they say they were on the ski club, played lacrosse, rotary, on and on. We're looking at two applications with the same grades. The school says this person is far more interesting or well-rounded than this person is. We can't neglect that when it comes to trying to produce the student that's able to be competitive in a number of areas in either college or careers. So you have got to address that issue. I don't know how else to put that, but the contraction of extracurricular activities starting with art and music is a problem. You've got to develop programs that enable kids to express themselves and to utilize the education that we're giving them in whatever vehicle so that they can do better.

Comm. Irving: From a funding standpoint, I always believe we missed the bus on different foundations and corporations that are able to help support initiatives like that. I think there are plenty of organizations that respect the work that we do as a district. I see it happen in Newark all the time. I always get ticked off by how much money Newark gets infused from private donors. A lot of it has to do with their proximity, but we never take the initiative to go out and really go after those dollars earmarked for providing more opportunities. I'd love to see a ski club. I'd love to see opportunities of a

travel club where we take kids across the country or overseas. Those are opportunities that if investigated can potentially be explored and help to make a more well-rounded student.

Comm. Hodges: We may be able to bring you one shortly, an activity similar to what we had last summer.

Comm. Irving: Great.

Comm. Rivera: That's a great idea. We used to travel when I was in Eastside. For three straight years we used to go to Puerto Rico. Assemblyman Wimberly did a lot of fundraisers and actually made it happen. I'm sure we can make it happen here.

Comm. Irving: You played baseball?

Comm. Hodges: I know there's a plan to address the computer science at some level so I'm not going to be redundant with that. However, there has to be some sort of commitment to engineering, not for engineering's sake, but in order to understand the discipline that they employ when they're problem-solving. That's the true value of engineering, solving problems via their approach, and additionally enhancing the technological capabilities of the school district.

Comm. Irving: We're currently working on a technology plan right now, right?

Dr. Evans: Yes.

Comm. Hodges: That has to become a priority because you're talking about cuts. That can go on the chopping block.

Comm. Irving: So here's what I have. They're diverse, but I think they're good starting points for us to be able to lock in the Superintendent and hold him accountable to. Once these plans get reflected in the budget, I would then request of the Superintendent on a bimonthly basis to hear reports on these goals and the status of them. For the record and for your information, Dr. Evans, a plan on the gap to close the P-3 language arts barrier that we're experiencing, the expectation is that this will be created and presented to the Board for future years how that's going to be implemented districtwide. I think the point Dr. Hodges and Comm. Kerr mentioned is there are some elements that might involve informing parents. There are some elements that might involve additional instruction or professional development and all those have costs. The second is to finish and design an effective curriculum and curriculum map over the next year to conduct a dual method assessment between a serving instrument and focus group on parent satisfaction survey to be able to hand to our Family and Community Engagement Department to help inform and support the work they're doing and the resources that should be going to them.

Comm. Hodges: Enhancing the STEM capabilities of the district. That would cover pretty much, not just the classroom, but the district as a whole. That would cover all of that.

Comm. Irving: The last one is a plan to either address or expand extracurricular activities within the district. Can I venture to say extracurricular activities outside of not just athletics but cultural activities in which we can help give kids opportunities? Again, I think that plan should be encompassing if we're going to try to influence activities for potential partners and funders. I want to thank everybody because these are awesome.

I think these are four very plausible goals, but they have to be reflected and stated in the next budget. We're not giving you 15 or 20. This is four. I think the expectation has to be that these get implemented and that they work. The good part is they need to be vetted and overseen within committee. Case in point, Dr. Hodges is in charge of curriculum and between the map and that P-3 plan before it comes to the Board it should come to curriculum first in some form of presentation. Whoever we use to do the assessment model needs to leverage that tool we had before and work with our Family and Community Engagement Department to be able to do so. As far as the extracurricular piece, that can either go through governance or curriculum. This is possible work for us to do, but if we get these four and then we can plan again next year for another four I think the Board is essentially taking charge and saying there are some key priorities that we want to be done that have to be reflected in the budget. Are there any other comments? I just want to be sure we're clear. On the 17th we're going to have our Board meeting, but there will be the formal presentation from the Superintendent on the specifics of the budget. At that point in time, Dr. Evans, the expectation will be for you to drill down and be able to explain to the Board what the actual key items are that will be addressed here. Then we will go into executive session to discuss the sensitive items that cannot be discussed because of legal and personnel implications. Then I think it makes sense for us to probably even have another meeting after that before the actual budget presentation or adoption to discuss any changes and additions. I appreciate you giving us this, Dr. Evans. But to me this has to be a menu of sorts. There are certain things that we may look at as a Board and say that is not going to happen. You may take out X and Y, but Z has to stay. I think the ability for us to understand what this stuff really means allows us a greater clarity to be able to say this is how this area may or may not be impacted. Are we clear about the 17th? Cheryl, can you just make sure the 17th schedule reflects the executive session to discuss personnel and legal matters pertaining to the budget? The things that should be discussed in public have to be discussed in public. It might be uncomfortable or it might not be what we want to do, but the budget is a public document and needs to be discussed as such. Any other information before we adjourn?

It was moved by Comm. Cleaves, seconded by Comm. Mimms that the meeting be adjourned. On roll call all members voted in the affirmative. The motion carried.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:08 p.m.