

MINUTES OF THE PATERSON BOARD OF EDUCATION WORKSHOP MEETING

November 4, 2015 - 6:41 p.m.
Administrative Offices

Presiding: Comm. Jonathan Hodges, President

Present:

Dr. Donnie Evans, State District Superintendent
Lisa Pollak, Esq., General Counsel

Comm. Chrystal Cleaves
Comm. Christopher Irving
Comm. Errol Kerr

*Comm. Lilisa Mimms
Comm. Flavio Rivera
Comm. Kenneth Simmons, Vice President

Absent:

Comm. Manuel Martinez
Comm. Corey Teague

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

Comm. Simmons 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:

**Workshop Meeting
November 4, 2015 at 6:30 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.

PRESENTATIONS AND COMMUNICATIONS

Dr. Evans: Tonight we have two presentations. The first one we're going to do in executive session at the end of the regular meeting because of the strong possibility of litigation and personnel issues associated with that litigation. For that, we're going to go upstairs to Conference Room C because we need audio/visual accommodations to be able to accommodate that. It's in regards to some technology issues that the technology committee has been involved with staff on.

Update on the Regional Achievement Center (RAC)

Dr. Evans: The Board has also asked for quite some time to hear from the Executive Director for the Regional Achievement Center that serves our district. To that end, I've been in conversation with that Executive Director, Ron Karsen, who was very happy to accommodate the Board and come and present an update to you and entertain any questions and conversations you'd like to provide the info you need regarding RACs. At this point, I'd invite to the microphone Ron Karsen.

Mr. Ron Karsen: Thank you, Dr. Evans. Good evening, Commissioners. Dr. Evans, as you said, I was excited about being here. I really am because I think this is long overdue and for me to have an opportunity to share some of the work that we're doing at Paterson Public Schools gives me great pride. I'm going to speak to a number of issues and I'm hoping that this tonight will be more of an informational session for us and that you would invite me back at future times to talk a little bit further about some of the other work, the impact that we're measuring, and the deliverables that we've had since we've been in Paterson. Tonight, if you will, just bear with me a little bit because I'd like to give more of a background as to the RAC, how schools were identified, what we're working with, and basically give you information on the process that we take our school leaders and district through to develop a comprehensive school improvement plan. What I'd like to do is start off a little bit about what we're not. I think many of you in the past have had interactions with the State Department and it has been on a CAPA level or a monitoring level. You sort of get that stigma that the state is here to put the sledgehammer on certain things and that's not what we are all about. I want to really elaborate on what we are and what the focus of the RAC is, and then also tie in the ends of how our work is aligned with the district closely. The three words that I chose to really emphasize the focus of the Regional Achievement Centers are these that are on the board. The first one is collaboration. You're going to see these three words constantly embedded within my presentation. Collaboration with the district and the school leaders, for them to understand that we are here to support their efforts, coaching, and when I start talking about systemic processes, to understand that we coach based on best practices, it's not a one size fits all, and then finally coherence, we are not here to impose or put any new spins on some of the things that we're working on with the district. Rather, we align our work with Dr. Evans' strategic plan and what we're all about in Paterson and give support to our schools and the district to actually implement some of these ideas on a much higher level. The three words that I do want to emphasize again are the collaboration, the coaching, and the coherence. The paradigm of where we used to be with school improvement and where we are now, I know my time is limited so I'm going to try to brush through some of these items. But if there is a need for further clarification or emphasis, of course, I will speak to that based on a question or either go back at a later date and emphasize this a little more deeply. When we talk about school improvement what we used to think way back when school reform started was that we used to implement fast and do it on a wide scale. We used to be able to identify a process or practice that we thought was going to work, implement it, and hope that it takes hold. What we also used to do was focus on standard effect, what works, as I said before, not taking into consideration that the collaboration has to take a great deal of emphasis, everybody working together. Everybody might take a different spin on this and we all don't have the same answer, but to come together and really emphasize the kind of work that we have to do. Also, scripting, we used to be able to say that we have a best practice, identify it, implement it, and then understand that we're going to make sure that one size fits all, it's going to happen in all schools, and that everybody is responsible to do this and come up with the same results.

*Comm. Mimms enters the meeting at 6:48 p.m.

Mr. Karsen: Now, we're really embracing instead of learning fast and sticking to one we're actually making a cyclical process of learning fast, but also taking what we learn to implement well and not just impose. We're also focusing on variability in performance. Again as I said before, it's not a one size fits all. When we start working with school improvement one of the things that we do emphasize is not to say that we have one plan, one program, or one process that works. We really start to dig deep and understand that we have to match, not only a program or a process, and to understand that it might work in different ways at different levels with different individuals and also with our students. Also, how to make it work, not just to say that we're going to again identify a process, but to work well in identifying the steps that it takes to make sure that it takes hold and that it does work. Then we would replicate some of the things that we see. Again, I'll talk specifically to the quality processes that we work with and understand that it's not just the RAC and it's not just the district. As we work collaboratively we accomplish much more. This is the part that I like more as an informational. Regional Achievement Centers were created by the New Jersey Department of Education to support and intervene in our Priority and Focus Schools. The department has identified Priority and Focus Schools in the following manner – to be eligible for a status or classification of a Priority School you had to be identified at the 5% of the lowest performing Title I schools within the state. With that, they identify them as Priority. With guidance and support from the district and the department senior leadership the RACs take the lead of developing and implementing customized interventions based on the needs of each school. When we identify the needs of each school we take into the consideration the eight turnaround principles. The eight turnaround principles are identified in the ESEA waiver and these are the processes that we work through with all of our schools. School leadership, school climate & culture, standards that are aligned to the standards, that there's curriculum, assessment, and intervention. We work on effective instructional practices, effective staffing practices, use of data, use of time, and family & community engagement. For Focus Schools now we go one step above. It's the lowest 10% of the schools. Instead of being identified as a Priority and deal with the total school population, they're categorized in a number of ways. They could be categorized as within school gaps for your school per subgroups. Also included in Focus Schools would be your high schools. Those schools were identified when they did the classification and identification of data from 2008-2009, 2009-2010, and 2010-2011. These were schools where the graduation rate was below 60%. Those high schools were identified as Focus Schools. Once they were identified, the district understood and agreed to a section of assurances. One of the things I want to highlight that has a lot of emphasis and I think has been targeted as a highlight in Paterson's implementation is that the district agrees that they would set up to 30% of the Title I allotment to school improvement. Paterson has met that requirement and they are vetted through our site-based supervisors providing instructional support for our teachers and our leaders, climate and culture, and data mentor specialists. The total budget for Title I is about \$14 million that came into Paterson and the cost of this support intervention is about \$4.3 million. As you can see, Paterson met that obligation and one of the things that I'm proud to say is that this is an initiative with these vetted site-based supervisors that Dr. Evans was only at this point required to implement in our Priority Schools. He decided that he was going to do it districtwide and schools that are not even categorized as Priority or Focus Schools are also getting this level of district support. As I go to Trenton, I'm constantly tooting the horn of Paterson because this was something that they said we realize this will have an impact as an intervention districtwide and we want to see it replicated. They also ensure that the Priority Schools are working with the RACs to develop individualized school improvement plans – and I'll take you through

the process of how that's delivered – and delineates interventions where the school and district will be accountable, and that they have operational flexibility in the areas of budgeting, staffing, and calendars to implement the approved SIPs with fidelity. They also make sure that in the Priority Schools we've identified a turnaround school leader and also leaders. Again, this is what was required in the ESEA waiver only in the Priority Schools. They have a leader in the areas of math, literacy, data, and climate and culture, and that they're highly skilled and embedded. This is the part where Dr. Evans chose to implement these leaders and site-based supervisors and climate and culture in all of the schools in the district. The executive director appoints the improvement of these staff members in these positions. I'm happy to say that collaboratively we work very closely to vet the application process of every site-based supervisor and we not only looked at their applications and resumes and hold them accountable, but we also looked at can they really walk the walk instead of talk the talk. How were they when they were in the classroom? Did they get the kind of turnaround results that we would expect them to model when they work with the district leaders and teachers? To that effect, we were very happy that it was very positive. We'll insure that they deliver English language arts and math curriculum in a formative assessment system aligned to the Common Core to all students and all subgroups. That is through the model curriculum framework and the assessments and all the schools in Paterson participate in all those areas. Also, we have in place reading and math interventions for students two or more years below grade, and proficiency as well as scheduling accommodations to ensure implementation fidelity. These are the assurances that the district has agreed to. These are the assurances that we work collaboratively with the district to make certain that are in place. But we also make certain, as I said in the beginning of my presentation, that the coherence and alignment to Dr. Evans' strategic plan is being given attention. How do we take them through this development process? This is a process. First of all, when we first start we take the schools through a self-assessment process of a quality school review called the QSR. The QSR identifies the eight turnaround principles and actually asks the leader to sort of identify where they would fall on a rubric. Is it fully implemented? Is there an area that they need to develop? Is there an area that they feel they are proficient in? Then we start to have conversations with the school leaders about looking at the data. Let's look at the forms of data as to why you think that your school is well-developed in this area. This is some good deep conversation that's leveraged through our leadership team meetings at the schools. They start to look at practices and if they feel that something is in place, and I'll give you an example, when a principal does the Quality School Review one of the areas of indicators in effective instruction is that we can meet the needs of all our learners. Meeting the needs of all our learners means our subgroups, our students who are two or more years below, and we develop an intervention around that. Sometimes we found that leaders might at face value think they're implementing it well. But when we start to look at variable forms of the data, you see that there might be a gap in that assessment. This is where the site-based supervisors, my team and I, along with the assistant superintendents and academic chiefs might have some conversation with the principals and say, "Let's look at that again. Do we really feel that we're well-developed in that area or do we need attention to that?" The next thing is once they see areas that might not be where they need to be, this is the identification of the performance challenges. Given the idea like I told you about student engagement, if a leader believes that this is something they have to focus in on they identify that as a performance challenge and then it transfers itself into a goal. As I told the principals and the district leaders, our schools are doing a lot of things. But in the School Improvement Plan it gives us an opportunity to focus on one goal, a few strategies, and more importantly, action steps that are monitored throughout the year with benchmark assessments to see how we are doing and how we are going to get there. So they have to develop four goals. The first one is in language arts, the second one is in

mathematics, and the third one is in climate and culture. Many of our climate and culture also looks at attendance and the graduation rate. Then the fourth goal that the schools have an opportunity to sort of develop on their own is effective instruction. As we started to look at the data, the one area that we found that really could use the most support is right there in the classrooms. So much of the work that we do along with the site-based supervisors in the district is to work with our school leaders to make sure that we're delivering an aligned instructional program, but also that the feedback that we give our teachers is going to be supportive and is going to take them to a much higher level of performance. First ELA goal, I just want to give you an example of how these goals were developed. Last spring when we sat down with the district and we looked at all of the data and we spoke with the principals and school leaders we said what is going to make the language arts scores move and how are we going to do that. They set themselves a measurable goal. The measurable goal for language arts was that they said as a result of tiered intervention throughout this year all reading strategies 70% of our students inclusive of all our subgroups – that's the students performing with different needs and intervention plans – would demonstrate a lexile growth from a district established growth performance report at a level. That would be measure through the STAR reading assessment or a modified running record. Once we had that goal, we met with the building leaders and we said this is something that's uniform throughout the district and you now have an opportunity to identify up to three strategies that you would like to implement in your school to support this goal attainment and then action steps throughout the year to get you there. Through conversation, visits, walk-throughs, and feedback sessions we track how the schools are doing throughout the year in the language arts. This is a picture of what the ELA SIP goal looks like. You can't see that, but it really speaks. You see on top it does cite the goal and develops and identifies the strategies. Most of the strategies that the schools picked were through guided reading and this was a big district initiative that's being implemented this year especially. Then they identified the action steps of what they would do methodically, training of the teachers, assessments that they would give, visits and feedback, and it's measured periodically throughout the year to see that they get there. So we work with them throughout the year on that. For mathematics, the goal that they decided on was mathematical reasoning. This was generic and they developed a rubric around implementation of mathematical practices. The site-based supervisors and the building leaders support the schools through professional development of mathematical reasoning through graphs, pictures, and charts. Their goal is that the schools will increase. They take a rubric baseline of every school in the fall and they hope that by the end of the year they're going to increase by at least 20%. By that measure, this is how we're talking and we're starting to get our first pieces of data for the first cycle review in now. That is what the math goal looks like. Climate and culture – we had to develop a measure in climate and culture and understand that this is a system. As we talk about systems there's a lot that goes into that. One of Dr. Evans' initiatives in the district was the implementation of PBSIS. How are we going to measure implementation of PBSIS? There are different ways that they can do it. Some chose to do it by increasing their attendance through intervention strategies. Others chose office conduct referrals and suspension data. So they actually put in processes and plans of how they would support their school in the implementation and lower the number of students that are being referred to the office and increase the attendance as well. For the high school with the cohort of 260 and the 80% through a structured systemic cohort management through credit recovery, monitoring, report of student recovery data, they would ensure that the students would be college-ready and that we would increase our graduation rate. This was the goal that they set for themselves and this is what the climate and culture goal looks like. For the fourth goal we had to do a measure that every school had an opportunity to choose on their own and this is an instructional practice goal based on the results of their individual quality school review. This

particular school chose that by the end of the third round of Paterson Public Schools observation 75% of the teachers in grades 4-8 content will be rated proficient 1 or higher on 3B and 3E media x standards relating to instructional strategies, relevant content, and result of targeted professional development increasing student engagement. Every school chose their own, again, based on the results of their own quality school review. This is where their professional development goes in. This is where the work of the site based supervisors takes place. They are site-based. They live in these schools. They support these teachers and principals through modeling classroom practices. They go in and conduct walk-throughs. They give feedback. They facilitate grade level meetings and professional development all related to the individual school's goal. This has been very powerful for us. Also, emphasis is placed with the fourth goal on effective instruction and we use the district intervention and instructional system. When the RAC first came out four years ago and I became the director in the second year I had 54 schools and we were RAC-1 and RAC-2. I serviced schools in Bergen County, Morris County, and also in Warren County way far up as far as Phillipsburg and Morristown. This past year the state with its reorganization decided to put emphasis where it counts the most and they created a standalone RAC just for our Paterson schools. So I'm the director this year and I'm happy to say although I have half the schools I had before, it's enabled me to give a much closer touch and support to the Paterson schools. This summer I sat down with my team and I said now that we have just the Paterson schools how can we best work with them. How can we make certain that we're helping the Paterson schools do what they need to do and get to where they need to be? What I'm sharing with you is the support plan that I shared with the district during senior cabinet and with Dr. Evans and Ms. Shafer. I'm not going to ask to go through each one of these columns, but more focus on some of the work. This is just a visual representation of what we do with these schools on a day-to-day basis. I'd like you to look at the left column because that's the Priority Schools and you know we have six of them in Paterson. Through these six schools this is the visual representation of how we would support that school through the year understanding that each school is different, each school has its own need, and we're flexible in developing an intervention support plan that will be relevant just to that school. But there are certain things that are put in place in the Priority Schools basically because of the ESCA waiver. In the Priority Schools they're required to have a state turnaround coach and he is there a minimum of two days a week. They support the building leaders and teachers in the implementation and development of strategies aligned to their school improvement plan and that addresses the eight turnaround principles. They also conduct at least one face-to-face check-in conversation with the building leader each week just for getting a pulse for how we're doing and what's going on, what are we using to measure this week, and plan next week's agenda. The building principal has facilitated leadership team meetings. These meetings are conducted at the school monthly and in some cases more where everyone is sitting around a table just like you are today and the building leader facilitates conversation with RAC teams and other members of the building leadership, with district leaders, and site-based supervisors. They have conversations about the implementation of the plan, how it's going, and develop a 30-day success plan. For example, if we're putting emphasis in guided reading and they had professional development for all the teachers, as the principal is doing the classroom visits with the assistant principals and the site-based supervisors they may see a need that occurs. Maybe our second grade teachers didn't get the kind of training we needed at the school so during this leadership team meeting they conduct and develop a success plan so that emphasis will go with those teachers in supporting them so that when they come back in the next 30 days they can talk about the deliverable and the impact that was measured based on their intervention. Success plans are developed. Site based district supervisors are assigned to the Priority Schools to support them. RAC specialists are in the Priority Schools every week

providing that additional support with the supervisors, leaders in the building, and teachers. The specialists conduct weekly check-ins with their district directors where they have conversation about the work that's going on because we want to be very transparent in what we're doing and we need their help. It's collaborative. We can't do it alone. We don't have all the answers, but we work together as a team to make certain that it happens. My team also conducts professional development foundational based on some of the items that they need developed through the school improvement plan. This is a fast piece of how this develops. It takes the whole year to do. We do look at a lot of data. We look at a lot of variable measurable forms of data. Then we start to quantify it by developing a plan that's comprehensive and addresses their needs. Also, we work with the schools in developing a systems approach. The systems approach is very important. As I said, it's not a one size fits all. It's not one program. It's not one particular way of addressing an issue. We try to have conversations with our building leaders in school management and operation process so that they understand that some artifacts work hand-in-hand in developing supporting leadership. We work with them on coaching and feedback that we give to our leaders and teachers to make them better than what they were before the conversation. We've worked with climate and culture on attendance, identifying our students who are chronically absent, putting in an intervention support plan in there. We're proud to say that we highlighted in Trenton one of Paterson's schools last year, School 5. Ms. Diodinet developed a strategy that she worked very well with her success mentors. That's not a program, but it's a strategy that worked. Sandra shared that with Trenton as I know she addressed the advisory board last year and she had some good positive results. That's what I spoke about in the beginning, taking these good practices and sharing them across the board, understanding that it might not work the same way in every school because they have different needs and different areas of focus, but it is a good practice that we want to put in place. We work on the instruction and intervention. Our site-based supervisors are the biggest intervention that we have developed by the district. The district through the data understands that if we're going to get the biggest bang for the buck it's going to happen in the classroom. So they spend a lot of time, resources, and effort. As I told you before in the beginning, the Title I allocation that was supposed to be set aside was done for this purpose of supporting these teachers, not on a monthly or yearly basis, but a day-to-day basis. Those site-based supervisors live in the Priority and Focus Schools. They conduct those grade level meetings. They conduct those articulation sessions. They model for the teachers. They conduct the professional development. They also provide feedback to these teachers to make our good teachers great. This is a tally sheet because we want to see where our work is and this is something that I'm tracking with my team. When they go into one of the schools they make sure that the principals are aware that they're going there and for what purpose. Then I send that information to the district. Even though September was a very short month and it was just started up, I'm proud to say that we had 102 visits to the Priority Schools. I'm just receiving the October and we're going to track that support that we give them. It could be through the form of a visit, coaching, participating in PD, or facilitating PD. It also helps me track the work of my team to make sure that they are reaching the schools and the areas that need the support the most. Dr. Evans said 10 minutes and I tried to be within that timeframe. This session was purely informational and I hope that you invite me back again to share additionally with you. If there are any questions about the presentation or information, I'd be happy to entertain them at this time.

Comm. Hodges: It's been so long since anyone's been here to address us that we couldn't be happier with you coming at all.

Mr. Karsen: Thank you.

Comm. Kerr: What is your level of participation in the area of effective family and community engagement? How much do we commit to that area in terms of resources?

Mr. Karsen: Don't forget, family engagement also falls under the climate and culture aspect. But we try to support the schools, not only within the building and developing a positive culture, but making sure that we have opportunities and new strategies of engaging the families and communities within the school. Mathematics is a new approach the way it's being done in the schools. Sometimes when we offer opportunities for PD we can't get everybody out. What are other ways that we can identify resources to conduct webinars, meetings, and facilitate other sessions so parents and community would be able to participate at a much more comprehensive level? So we're getting the idea of identifying resources and if we can't do it, we tap into people and resources that we know to help support the schools at that level.

Comm. Kerr: The purpose for the question is a big part of the Priority Schools' problem is that we don't have parents coming out, owning the building, participating, and making sure that their children are properly serviced. There's disconnect between the parents' relationship with the schools and so on. We realize this piece of it is broken. I just need to know how best we address this problem. Do we address this in terms of setting aside a set amount of resources?

Mr. Karsen: Again, it's based on need and on looking at data. What you spoke about is very serious and we give attention to that. With Dr. Evans' plan of PBSIS they do a climate and culture survey twice a year. That survey is given out and we have to make sure that we meet the requirements of a certain number of parents responding to that, staff members, and students. Through our leadership team meetings in the schools the leaders communicate this information with all stakeholders and then they develop an ad-hoc committee. So if the survey says that we need to give more attention and support to our parents in a particular area, then the school develops a very specific action plan to address that concern that may not have gotten at least 70% satisfaction on their survey. They do that for their stakeholders of parents, staff, and students. Thus we recognize students in different ways. We support our staff in different ways, all based on the results of this survey. So when you talk about the resources, we try to be very specific and aligned in the support, but I must tell you that it's coming from a lot of district initiatives as well. It's not just RAC. Collaboratively we're working to give our help and support in that, but more or less engaging in the conversation about what's being done at the district level with that. We talked with Kemper, T.J., and Dr. Evans and there are a lot of great things that are happening and recognizing it. They also recognize they're not where they need to be yet too.

Comm. Kerr: Do you have any documentation to share to let the Board know that these things are really happening and just not being said?

Mr. Karsen: I have the results of the surveys and the action plans that were developed at each school level.

Comm. Kerr: Will that be shared with the Board?

Mr. Karsen: We can do that. I can share that with Dr. Evans and if you'd like me to come back at a later date. That information was so important and we got so much out of that. I'll give you an example, in one of my other districts that I was working in before I went to just Paterson the staff gave a very low score to the school and felt that they weren't being supported by the building administration. If you look at it at face value this is a problem. But as that ad-hoc committee was created and they started to ask why,

what they found out there is that a new evaluation tool was put in place in the district and now the principals because of the process for Achieve New Jersey were giving a lot more focus to areas that made certain individuals a little uncomfortable. We looked at that and then a creative plan was developed to support the teachers at the administrative level so that they don't feel that anxiety of not being supported that they are. It gave them focus and that's what we're doing in Paterson with the results of those climate and culture surveys. I can get for Dr. Evans the results of the surveys and they're being conducted right now for the fall and that window should be closing. Then the plans that the schools are addressing for that and some of the action steps and to know that yes indeed it's happening. But if you look at the climate and culture goal through PBSIS, many of those proven research-based strategies are happening on a regular basis and we're proud that some schools are implementing it at a very high level. We're seeing that the turnout for parent meetings and these sessions are increasing. It's never where you want it to be. What you want is 100%, but they're growing. We can show you that data most definitely.

Comm. Hodges: That was part of the question that I had. You're supposed to share these plans with the parents as part of the process. Is that not correct?

Mr. Karsen: The school improvement plans?

Comm. Hodges: Yes.

Mr. Karsen: The school improvement plans are shared with all stakeholders by the building leaders. They're developed and I want to be clear. They're not developed by the RAC. They're developed by the district and the schools. During faculty meetings I have been there and the schools have shared that with the staff and during PTA meetings they have been addressing that with the parents and telling them what their goals are. A couple of schools have sent me newsletters where the school improvement plan goals are cited there, what they're going to be held accountable to this year to do, and how they're going to support all the stakeholders including the parents. We could get that information to you as well, but the schools do share it with all stakeholders.

Comm. Hodges: That's one of the concerns, that that's adhered to. Then the Board is entrusted with the oversight of the process and our parents are receiving information that we're not. So we don't have a sense of what's going on in these buildings via the RAC, whether or not it's working or anything because in the past there hasn't been that kind of communication. I'm hoping that on a regular basis that the RAC will come and present to us so that we have an understanding of what kind of trajectory our schools are on, whether it's negative or positive, so that we can challenge the Superintendent to either address it with more resources or whatever has to happen so those schools are on the proper trajectory. Without knowing what the RAC has put forward or what plans you've helped develop we have no idea what's going on. We're just out here in the dark even though our parents who we're responsible to seem to have a better idea than we, which is troubling.

Mr. Karsen: That's why I'm so excited to be here tonight and I hope I've turned that corner and we opened the door so that if you would like me to come back I could do that. I don't want you to get tired of hearing me. I will bring members of my team. My climate and culture specialists can speak to the surveys and the results. I can have some of my coaches talking about some of the work. Absolutely we would love to do that and I would be available to do that on a regular basis.

Comm. Hodges: We can also look to find ways to increase the parental engagement. Particularly when parents know that they are part of the larger process that may help to stimulate that. If it's not happening, we could also direct some additional attention in that area. So I'm hoping to see a more robust collaboration between the RAC and the Board so that we can work together to make sure that this works well for our schools. Of greater concern to me in particular is the notion that if our schools are not responding appropriately we run the risk of having them taken over by the state. The question that I would then have is I don't know whether the plan was appropriate or whether the plan was not adhered to. I have no way of being able to judge that. If the state came tomorrow and said School 95 did not respond to this RAC program and we're taking them over, then I'm going to be distressed because I knew nothing about what takes place there, even though some parents may have. That's a concern.

Mr. Karsen: Dr. Hodges, I'll be in conversation with Dr. Evans and I'd be more than happy to present all that information to you. But what you're bringing up is a good point and a point of closure for us too, the exit criteria. I'm not looking at what happens if they don't, but how do some of the schools get out of status? Some of it is qualitative and some is quantitative. With the new PARCC assessment, that quantitative piece is now being tweaked and they're looking at that. But let me read to you the criteria to exit status at this point. To exit status of a Priority School you no longer meet the definition of a Priority School for two consecutive years. When you're doing your tally of categorization those schools don't fall on the bottom 5% for two consecutive years. Also, the qualitative piece is that they successfully implement all the interventions on the QSR. So you see how it was so important for them to take a real close analytic look at where they are? When they develop their school improvement plan, that's their measure and if they really see that the data, whether it's through observations or walk-throughs, that they have to focus on teacher practice through student engagement, they're going to put a lot of effort into that. That's the area of instruction. They do that through all eight turnaround principles and we are there supporting them along the way. For that aspect we have seen our schools and districts be the most cooperative in taking feedback, running with it, and facilitating interventions. It's not the RAC or the district is telling them, but rather them looking within themselves and coming up with these intervention ideas in a different way, making sure that they're flexible. The paradigm in learning to improve is that it's not a one fixed approach. You're constantly learning from what you implemented and readjusting. It's a cyclical plan. Plan it, do it, rethink it, did it work, did it not, and go back to the table. That's why it's so important when I talk about coaching, collaboration and coherence, we're not there evaluating. They develop these plans. We're there to support, help them, and give them and the district the resources that we have. We don't have all the resources. We're just one piece. But as we work together we're trying to see exactly how we can move the lever. The third one is that the schools in Priority status demonstrate a high level growth on SGPs, that's the Student Growth Percentiles. It used to be 65% and now it's reduced through the new renewal ESCA waiver to 55%. So when you look at students who scored 160 on the PARCC and then another student scored 160 on the PARCC, how you're measured with an SGP is that through interventions are you keeping up? Are we exceeding? Are you doing better because of additional resources? That's how schools are measured. We're not looking at proficiency. We're looking at growth. Are your students growing the way they should be? What the state established with the waiver with the regulations is that for a student growth percentile, and there's a whole method to this, 55% is an acceptable score. If a school in Priority status meets all those exit criteria they are then recommended for exit. The Focus Schools are a little bit different. They still have to go with the SGPs. They still have to do the QSR. They still have to be for two consecutive years at least not identified as a Focus School. They have to meet the targets for the groups that they were identified in. In Priority Schools it's

school wide. In Focus Schools you may be there because your special education population subgroup didn't perform well. But you have a target that you have to meet each year. It's progressive and it grows. We have to ensure that with interventions and support that those schools are moving those subgroups to meet their targets. If they meet those targets for three consecutive years then they're able to receive recommendation to exit status. That's the one that's very clear. That's the quantifiable criteria. We're working with the schools more on the qualitative piece. Are we developing good interventions? Are they sound? Are they being implemented properly? Are we measuring the deliverable? If we put a lot of impact into something, are we getting the bang for the buck? You just don't want to keep doing stuff and getting the same results. With conversation we don't say, "You don't do it." Can we look at it a different way? Can we interject another intervention? Can we do something different? Dr. Evans, with the identification of these site-based supervisors, feels very strongly that if we're going to make a difference, and I agree totally, it's going to be at every classroom level one at a time bringing them together at the classroom. That's where all our focus is, on improving the practice that we see in the classroom to make sure that it's aligned, rigorous, and that we're monitoring it not in an evaluative way, but is it having a positive deliverable. I know I went on a little too long.

Comm. Mimms: Based on what you stated, do we have access to the original data that these schools were classified as Priority or Focus Schools and what the data showed if there was any progression or digression? Do we have the information for that?

Mr. Karsen: The information is public. It has been given to the district. The district has it and I'm sure, Dr. Evans, if it's a request we can share that. I can spend a whole evening just elaborating on the eligibility of exit and where they are. It talks about SGPs, not only for your school wide but for your subgroups. We can have a good conversation on that and that will keep you aware of what you need and why they were identified in the first place.

Comm. Hodges: A component of the progress of a high school certainly depends on the students that come in from the elementary schools. How does a high school show reasonable progress if the sending schools are not quite progressing overall?

Mr. Karsen: They take that into consideration, but the high schools that we've identified, especially in Paterson and some other districts, are not there specifically as an identifiable low-performance group but more for grad rate. We're working with the schools to increase their grad rate. When the waiver first came out they put the fact there that schools had to reach a 75% grad rate and then they went up to 78% because we're seeing some good growth. Now the conversation is when a school reaches 78% do we just say they're out of status? Or do we want to work with that school to make sure that they're going to be able to sustain that growth? Then the part B is not only that you hit that magic number, but that you've demonstrated that over a three-year period you had at least 25% more of your students graduating. So there's a two-pronged result. It's not just hitting the 78%, but that you've increased the number of graduates. What we do in supporting the high schools and they have in their school improvement plan, they too have a language arts goal, a math goal, an attendance goal, or climate and culture goal. One of the things we have conversation about is we believe one of the variables why students drop out is because they're not succeeding. We're trying to support an instructional program. It's not to say that's the only variable, but it's something we definitely have to take into consideration and work with them so that we have strong instructional programs to move them along. Again, there's no magic number. You're always looking at growth when you're looking at quantifiable data.

Comm. Hodges: Thank you very much. Dr. Evans, I would like to say that I hope the Board has a copy of what these requirements are because as a part of our Board goals we need to look at how these things are progressing. So I would definitely like to have that in our hands. And we would certainly love to talk to you again.

Mr. Karsen: It's my pleasure. I thank you. Again, I was excited to be here and hopefully through these continuous conversations the Board is going to be very comfortable with the work that collaboratively we're doing with the district. We'll be able to share at a later date other areas like the data that you're talking about. It's very important to see are we on that trajectory and are we moving along that way. That's something that's quantifiable data that we can provide.

Comm. Hodges: It will be interesting to see, since we have 54 schools, whether or not some of these approaches can be expanded to some of these other schools.

Dr. Evans: As Mr. Karsen had indicated, we actually are doing much of what we're doing in Priority and Focus Schools in all our schools. In every case it's not necessarily the same level of support, but the same type of support maybe at a lower level in terms of frequency and distribution of schools among school-based supervisors, for example.

Mr. Karsen: That's just one intervention. If you looked at the support plan that I gave you, you can see that it's a tiered approach. Every group is not getting the same support. If a school has a subgroup of special education that we have to concentrate on, then we're giving the support there. They may not need it in another area. As Dr. Evans said, it's tiered and it's not always the same.

Comm. Hodges: Thank you very much.

Mr. Karsen: Thank you for your attention. I know I took longer than I should have.

REPORT OF STATE DISTRICT SUPERINTENDENT

Dr. Evans: I have three additional areas on which to very briefly comment. The first item has to do with QSAC. We are at the present time being subjected to a QSAC review. The team is in the district. It has visited schools, met with various individuals representing our departments or divisions, and has reviewed tons of data and other information that was provided as evidence to support that we're meeting the QSAC standards. In the brief conversations that I've had with Bob Davis, the County Executive Superintendent who is leading this visit, it seems to be going very well. In fact, just based on his comments it looks like we're well on our way to doing well enough to be awarded at least one additional DPR area but maybe more. Again, I want to caution they're not done yet. So what I'm saying is he may come in tomorrow and give me a different scenario. But the conversations we've had so far have been very positive. He's very complimentary of us. So I want to thank in advance the individuals representing the various departments and divisions that have been a part of his visit. A special thank you to Ms. Shafer and Mr. Best for leading the effort and making sure that everyone had their material to support that we are meeting the standard. As soon as it's complete and we get a report we will be communicating as quickly as we can with the Board. Mr. Davis has promised a very quick turnaround in terms of the results and getting them back to us so we'll know where we are. The next item that I want to very briefly mention is the organization chart. My plans were to have it for you tonight. You've been asking for it. But then as we were reviewing it for one final time we found some additional positions that weren't where they were supposed to be on the chart.

My secretary left before I could get her to correct them and so what we're going to do is get them corrected. Mrs. Jones, she's not going to be here tomorrow, right?

Ms. Jacqueline Jones: (Comments were made away from the microphone and were not heard on tape.)

Dr. Evans: But we'll get it to you as quickly as possible. We promised it to you. I thought we were ready to bring it and hand it to you tonight, but then we found some names out of place or the wrong names for positions that we've already made some adjustments. Then the last item that I want to do is introduce some new members of our staff. We've had ongoing conversations about our staff. We've had large numbers of staff leaving us to go on to bigger and brighter things, promotions in other school districts or leaving us for other reasons. We've been engaged heavily in replacing those staff, particularly at the senior level, but at the school level as well both in terms of administrative staff and classroom teachers. Sitting to my left are new members of our staff that I would like to very briefly introduce. You know these people. These aren't new people to you, but I've not introduced them in the past in the current roles that they're in. First, Cicely Warren who is former principal of School 9 is now officially Assistant Superintendent for Unit I. Unit 1 was the area that Aubrey Johnson supervised. He's not here tonight, and he is official, and when I say official that means we've gone through the processes internally and DOE has approved it. In one or two cases they've given verbal approval but we don't have it in writing yet. Not here tonight, unless he came in and I didn't see him come in, is David Cozart. As of January 1, 2016 he will be the Assistant Superintendent for Unit III, our high schools. As you know, David is presently the Principal of Operations for JFK. We'll have him at the next meeting to more formally introduce him. Cheryl Coy is official as the Acting Chief Special Education Officer and she was formerly in the director of non-traditional programs position. Dr. Annalesa Barker is Acting Chief Accountability and Data Officer, one of the positions that was vacated by Marnie McKoy. Marnie actually was in a dual role between this particular division and the Human Capital Office. Mr. Luis Rojas, Executive Director for Labor Relations and Affirmative Action, is now our Acting Human Capital Officer. That's a role that we are very close to filling permanently, but I appreciate Mr. Rojas agreeing to step up and fill that need for us. As we continue to fill the other senior management roles we will introduce them to you. Obviously, we're following the process that we instituted working through the personnel committee to ultimately vet candidates as we interview and make our initial decisions before we then go public and go to the DOE for final approval. That concludes my comments for the night, Mr. President.

REPORT OF BOARD PRESIDENT

Comm. Hodges: Very quickly, I just want to report a number of items to the Board. There had been a request for a community-based forum on transportation. We are still waiting for the results of the special education investigation. We have to schedule that report. We had hoped to have a planning meeting at the end of October or early November to discuss Board goals. However, we're waiting for both QSAC and the audit, which I understand is in some sort of limbo. Additionally, we're waiting for the PARCC results to come back before we can schedule those. We also would like to have a joint meeting with Newark and Jersey City looking at early December. Newark has responded and they're very interested in doing this. I'm still waiting on Jersey City to get back to me. I met with the Commissioner at the workshop. Ms. Mimms and Mr. Kerr were introduced to the Commissioner since he hasn't been able to get to meet the Board as a whole. Mr. Kerr raised the issue about vocational schools and the problem we're having with our students who are vocationally oriented not being admitted to Tech

because Tech is pursuing an academy-level approach which does not serve or support the needs of our students. We said that this was a growing issue, not just with Paterson, but in a number of vocation techs across the state. They're declining to serve the kids who are not going to college or who are vocationally oriented. The Commissioner said he would in fact be very interested in taking a look at what can be done in this area. Lastly, the Zeist Company, who's the maker of our planetarium equipment, has decided that they were willing to fly a number of people from the district and the Board to Germany to take a look at their new equipment. Apparently what we saw two years ago now their equipment surpasses all of that in dramatic ways. The issue was they would also be willing to come to Paterson and redo the shows that they put on over a two-day period so that a number of people could come and see what this equipment does. I thought that would be far better than me and the Superintendent flying to Germany. This is an opportunity for the staff to take a look at what this equipment can do and then look at the possibilities for curricular changes and things and also potential fundraisers to be invited to see what we're trying to do here. They've agreed on their own dime to come and do this and we're looking to find a way to schedule that going forward. I think those are the last items.

PUBLIC COMMENTS AND SPECIAL SESSION ON POLICIES AND REGULATIONS FOR SECOND READING

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

Ms. Marcella Simadiris: Peace and blessings. I don't feel supported by the RACs. Mr. Karsen's comments don't speak for me. I just wanted to say that. I don't want to spend too much time. I've spoken about issues I've had with them and the lack of accountability. I've had meetings with my site supervisor and it's a blame game. When I'm looking for answers they refer me to the district. Then when I'm speaking to the district they don't have access to that information. There is a lot of discussion that needs to take place around that and it shouldn't just be based on this man coming up here and showing these slides. I would love if his presentation could be put on the Paterson School District and we can have some transparency. It's hard to digest it all and I would like to take some time to go through it. I have reached out for support and I don't know if it's a lack of will or skill. I don't feel supported and a lot of the initiatives are with a lack of equitable schedules. Again, our schedules are just decreasing in quality and opportunity for our students. I did want to mention again Sustainable Jersey. I went to the State Board meeting. They presented today. I'm wondering where we are in this. I know, Dr. Evans, you told me that you would have Dr. Newell do some research and present to the cabinet. So I'm eager to hear where we are with that piece. I'm also trying to figure out what's going on with Full Service Community Schools. Napier Academy is a Full Service Community School. I've been informed that there is no budget for us and apparently through the grants that were given five years ago there was never any sustainability plan put into it. So now all the money is gone and there's no way of sustaining it. It doesn't function like it's supposed to function. Supposedly we have these Full Service Community Schools and our children have all these opportunities but I don't see it. So I would like some oversight to it. The whole issue with the playground was through them. They're blaming the district with the process of the grants and the district not complying with surveys and other things and then they lost grant funding. But when I speak to the district they're saying they didn't have anything to do with it, it was all grants. It's just a blame game. There's a lack of oversight and I'm just looking for accountability for my students at Napier Academy. They're the best and I do want to just say thanks to Ms. Bridget from the Parent

Community Engagement. She came out to Napier Academy on Friday and it was a great success. We had 36 parents. Parents do come out, but they come out when you want to build relationships and get to know them, and not tell them all about what they're doing wrong. Just tell them that you want to get to know them and they will come out. Thank you.

Ms. Rosie Grant: Good evening. I was also at the State Board meeting and I enjoyed bringing you those reports because we then don't have to wait until it comes out through the communications bureaucracy. What was interesting also today in addition to Sustainable New Jersey and the plan to move towards all green buildings in New Jersey was that the PARCC cut scores were released. I'm going to read it so I don't get it wrong. Assistant Commissioner Bari Ehrlichson reported that if current students want to use the PARCC for graduation requirements they will need a 4 in English language arts in grades 9 and 10, and a 3 in grade 11. Or if they choose to use math, they will need a 4 in math for grade 9 and a 3 in grades 10 and 11. Commissioner Hespy also said that the study commission on assessment would make final recommendations for regulatory purposes for the class of 2020 and beyond. Until the class of 2020 is ready to graduate the kids can choose between one PARCC subject area, the ACT or SAT test, or portfolio assessment. Those regulations will come later, but this was what was reported to the State Board of Education meeting today. That said, I want to thank the district for collaborating with the PARCC forum that we had where Bari came in to explain to parents what the new reports will look like. That was very informative. I know that a lot of administrators were there also and I thank you for coming and supporting. Bari is going to come back in January to talk with us about Paterson PARCC scores as we move forward and the school report cards because they will look different so that we don't compare the PARCC scores to the test that was in existence previously. I just wanted to bring you that short report and to say thank you for your work.

Comm. Hodges: Dr. Evans, is there some way that we can do a stronger job of advertising that return meeting with Bari Ehrlichson? I think we didn't have a lot of turnout from parents and this is going to be a seed change in our approach, not only to graduation, but looking at testing. We really need to find a way to make sure that more parents have an understanding of what this looks like and what this means.

Dr. Evans: We can access some of the tools that we have and the mechanism that allows us to call every household, for example. We are careful as to how we use that because we don't want to abuse it and we don't want to get to the place where parents see our number and don't want to answer. That's one tool and other tools that we can use. The answer is yes we can.

Comm. Hodges: I would like to plan to do that. I think it's crucial that parents be brought up to speed on what this test is. When you look at the data it could be overwhelming because it's not like their old report cards. They may just come and stare and say, "What is this?" if they have no understanding. I think that we really have to engage in some sort of strong effort to get them to the table behind this.

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.

RESOLUTIONS FOR A VOTE AT THE WORKSHOP MEETING:

Resolution No. 1

BE IT RESOLVED, that the list of bills and claims dated October 29, 2015, beginning with vendor number 149 and ending with vendor number 799535, in the amount of \$13,704,400.69, and checks beginning with number 195695 and ending with number 195925, in the amount of \$16,275,256.83 approved on October 21, 2015; and

BE IT RESOLVED, that each claim or demand has been fully itemized verified, has been duly audited as required by law in accordance with N.J.S.A. 18A:19-2.

It was moved by Comm. Cleaves, seconded by Comm. Mimms that Resolution No. 1 be adopted. On roll call all members voted in the affirmative, except Comm. Hodges who voted no, Comm. Mimms who abstained, 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 Comm. Rivera who abstained on anything dealing with the NJCDC, if necessary. The motion carried.

Resolution No. 2

WHEREAS, Pursuant to N.J.S.A. 18A:7A and N.J.A.C. 6A:30, once every three years, districts are required to undergo a full New Jersey Quality Single Accountability Continuum (NJQSAC) district performance evaluation and must complete the District Performance Review (DPR) and districts are required to annually complete the NJQSAC Statement of Assurance (SOA) and to conduct facilities reviews in each of the district's school buildings, using a facilities checklist provided by the NJDOE, and

WHEREAS, as part of Cohort I, Paterson Public Schools underwent a Full NJQSAC Review during the 2013-2014 school year and must submit the 2015-2016 SOA to the NJDOE via NJ Homeroom by November 15, 2015, and the State District Superintendent has convened a committee to assist in completing the SOA in accordance with N.J.A.C. 6A:30-3, and

WHEREAS, Upon completion of the proposed responses to the SPA, the district board of education shall fix a date, place and time for the holding of a public meeting, which may be a regularly scheduled meeting of the district board of education, at which time the proposed responses to the SOA, and declaration page shall be presented to the district board of education for approval by resolution and,

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the district Board of Education has reviewed the 2015-2016 New Jersey Quality Single Accountability Continuum (NJQSAC) Statement of Assurance (SOA), attests to the accuracy of the State of Assurance responses and approves the submission of the NJQSAC SOA to the New Jersey Department of Education.

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

Comm. Kerr: I just got this a minute ago. It is 17 pages. What must I do with this?

Dr. Evans: May I call Mr. Best to the mic, please?

Mr. T.J. Best: Good evening. Actually, what you received was an update. It actually went out yesterday. This is an annual statement of assurance that we have to do every

single year, but because the county office is currently doing a QSAC review they asked the Board to do the most updated version. It's actually not due until the next Board meeting, but they asked us to push it up further so that they could have something to base their review over on Monday.

Comm. Kerr: You realize that if I vote on this I would not know what I'm voting on because I've not read it.

Mr. Best: It got sent yesterday.

Comm. Kerr: To whom?

Mr. Best: It went to the Board yesterday. It hasn't gone to the county yet.

Comm. Kerr: I'm old. I don't remember from last year to this year what this is about. I would still need a few more minutes to know what I'm voting on.

Mr. Best: Just as a means of an update, this is an annual document. We have to do a statement of assurance every single year. The questions are exactly the same for the Board members who have been here before. They haven't changed. However, our scores have updated. The scores that you received yesterday were the scores that we had last year. The scores that you just received in front of you, which is on page 4, there were only two changes. I'll quickly point them out to you. In instruction and program last year we got three out of five questions correct, which was 60%. This year we got 4 out of 5 questions correct, which is 80%. So the scores went up from 60% to 80%. Then in operations we scored 20% last year, which was 100%, but after we went and reviewed our documents we realized that in question #2 for operations we actually had an error rate over 2% in one of the NJ Smart things that we had to report. We took that off and it dropped down to 95%. Outside of that everything else is the same.

Comm. Kerr: So this represents our in-house scores, our self-assessment.

Mr. Best: Yes.

Comm. Hodges: Mr. Kerr, are you requesting time to read this over?

Comm. Kerr: If the only page that is relevant here is page #4, then I can go ahead with it. Is there any other page that is relevant?

Mr. Best: No. Everything else is exactly the same.

Comm. Hodges: I don't anticipate a long agenda tonight. Do you want to take 10 minutes and look it over?

Comm. Kerr: If it's only page #4, it's okay with me.

Comm. Hodges: Okay. I haven't read it so I'll act accordingly. Is there any further discussion?

On roll call all members voted in the affirmative, except Comm. Simmons who abstained and Comm. Hodges who voted no. The motion carried.

Resolution No. 3

INTRODUCTION: the New Jersey Department of Education (NJDOE) is required to notify local educational agencies (LEAs) regarding schools that have been determined to be persistently dangerous based on the criteria set forth under the Unsafe School Choice Option (USCO) policy, which was developed pursuant to the provisions of the Title IX, Part E, Section 9532 of the federal No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB); and

WHEREAS, Rev. Dr. Frank Napier, Jr. School is at risk of being designated a persistently dangerous school, based on a review of the pattern of offenses reported on the Electronic Violence and Vandalism Reporting System (EVVRS) for the school for two consecutive years; and

WHEREAS, See attached criteria data sheet that supports the early warning designation for Rev. Dr. Frank Napier, Jr. School; and

WHEREAS, this early warning provides the District with an opportunity to review the data and create a safety plan to address the areas of concern; and

WHEREAS, the attached safety plan is in effect for the 2015-2016 school year.

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Paterson Public School District submits the attached school safety plan for Rev. Dr. Napier, Jr. School.

It was moved by Comm. Cleaves, seconded by Comm. Mimms that Resolution No. 3 be adopted. On roll call all members voted in the affirmative, except Comm. Hodges who voted no. The motion carried.

GENERAL BUSINESS

Items Requiring a Vote

Curriculum and Instruction

Comm. Hodges: Curriculum did not meet Monday. It will be meeting next Monday. Are there any questions that you have regarding the items?

Legal

Comm. Simmons: The legal committee has not met. There will be a meeting scheduled for next week. We have Items B-1 through B-3 on the agenda. Are there any questions?

Policy

Comm. Simmons: Policy hasn't met since earlier this month. We do have Item E-1, which will be presented at the regular meeting for second reading. Are there any questions?

Fiscal

Comm. Kerr: The fiscal committee met on October 29 and present at that meeting were Comm. Teague and myself. From the staff we had the Business Administrator Ms. Daisy Ayala. We looked over the IDEA/NCLB update. She gave us an update on the

finance year 2015 year-end numbers. We also looked at the transportation three-year trend. We also did the bills list. Tonight we present C-1 through C-11. Are there any questions?

Facilities

Comm. Hodges: Unfortunately, facilities did not have an opportunity to meet yesterday. I just realized that. There are no facilities items. Can we have a brief update on the status of the Colt Street building, Dr. Evans?

Mr. Steve Morlino: I was at Colt Street today and took a tour through the building. Unfortunately, the developer wasn't there but I did correspond with him by email. We are anticipating that he will have all his inspections done within the week. One elevator was operational while I was there today. There were crews working on both elevators. I was happy to see that because that's been a problem. I'm glad to report Verizon is out of the picture. They've brought Optimum in and they've already installed the necessary cabling to get the program up and running that Verizon hasn't been able to do for months. They did it in several days so I understand that's complete. The final connections of all the HVAC units were under way while we were there this morning. Public Service has completed their part so they're now able to wire up these HVAC units and test them. Everything else appeared to be moving along well. We have 61 days as of tomorrow to hit our deadline. I stressed to him the importance of establishing a timeline and a critical path if anything falls through the cracks where we're going. It looks like we're on target at this point.

Comm. Hodges: Are there any questions about Colt Street?

Dr. Evans: Mr. Morlino, would you update the Board also on Boris Kroll and the testing that we've done there?

Mr. Morlino: We did an extensive amount of environmental testing at the request of a number of complaints that were registered with the PEOSHA people. The state came out. We've done testing insofar as asbestos and lead. We've done VOCs, volatile organic compound testing. As you're aware, that site is a brown field site so we were concerned if there was any vaporization taking place. There is none. We looked at various allergens. We looked at mold. All tests came back negative. The only thing that was discovered was very minor cat, dog, and mouse dander, which is common in that type of building and environment. There was nothing indicative of a problem, sick building syndrome, or anything like that at that facility. We've also asked the state to come in and they are looking at the building next to the school. The asbestos people are in because there were complaints about the contractors throwing things out the window instead of using a construction chute. That's been addressed by the city code officials also. At this point things have quieted down and all environmental testing has come well within the parameters established by the state.

Comm. Hodges: Has this information been sent to the president of the union?

Dr. Evans: Yes, in writing by me.

Comm. Hodges: Thank you. Dr. Evans, there's still some question about the property at Hope 6 Project, in particular the lease. I don't want to get into discussions about leases here in public, but has there been any movement on the discussion of the legislative bill that's been in...

Dr. Evans: Ms. Pollak has had conversations with Senator Pou.

Ms. Pollak: No. I reached out to Senator Pou, but I did not get the response. Actually, Dr. Hodges, you and I discussed perhaps reaching out to another senator. I actually did put down what I thought would be an appropriate legislative amendment revision. If we had some people to move it for us and we're also working on that communication down to the DOE.

Comm. Hodges: I would like that language as soon as possible. The concern is the opportunity to partner with the group that is putting together the medical school at St. Joe's. That window is closing because they may in fact downsize their building, which will mean that we cannot obtain any floors in that building for HARP and we will lose that opportunity. I think at this point, unless Dr. Evans, you have an opportunity to speak to somebody in the municipal government quickly, the Hope 6 Project is at stake and so is...

Dr. Evans: There is one that I think may not be available anymore.

Comm. Hodges: One down and two more to go. We can sit here and wait or we can move expeditiously to get this thing done because we're running out of time. Something has to be done. School is closed tomorrow.

Ms. Pollak: You and I talked down in Atlantic City. I'll talk to anybody that it's appropriate for me to talk to. I can reach out to Senator Rice.

Comm. Hodges: Let me call his office and tell him that you're going to be reaching out to him since we're unable to get anything done here. We'll also send the language that you need to Shavonda Sumter and Assemblyman Wimberly to try to make sure that the language they were crafting is commensurate with what we're trying to accomplish. Thank you very much.

Items Requiring Review and Comments

Personnel

Comm. Cleaves: The personnel committee met on Monday, November 11. In attendance were myself and Comm. Mimms. We formally introduced ourselves to Mr. Rojas for the first time. We know that there are many concerns in personnel at this time, but the biggest one was School 21 from the previous Board meeting. That's what the topic of our discussion was. If I can call Mr. Rojas to the microphone to just give everyone updates as to what has been taking place concerning all the vacancies that were at School 21.

Comm. Hodges: Do we have an updated list of the vacancies?

Comm. Cleaves: We do. You received it by email yesterday. We received an updated list. I haven't had a chance to look through it completely, but we did receive something that we asked for on Monday.

Comm. Mimms: I did review it, but it's not accurate to the count that was discussed in the personnel meeting. The numbers are different. I want to just listen to what Mr. Rojas has to say.

Mr. Luis Rojas: Unfortunately, those numbers are always a moving target. We do get resignations. The list that you have is the most current list. The one dated November 2 is the most updated one. We get constant resignations and leaves of absences so that number fluctuates. Today we can have 80, tomorrow we can have 70, and it goes back up to 90 the next day. I'm just throwing some numbers out there. It is a pretty moving target on a consistent basis. But we are targeting School 21. We have some actions today to hire some folks. It's about two or three. I don't remember off the top of my head. There are interviews being conducted for these positions. We are going to hit School 21 hard. I anticipate hopefully within the next couple of weeks being fully staffed. That's my goal. I mentioned at our personnel meeting we have a job fair slated for this room on the 17th and 19th where we're inviting some principals, specifically School 21 as well, to sit down and hopefully hire some folks on the spot off contingency contracts and knock out the majority of our vacancies within those two days. We've advertised in the newspapers. I have some resumes that have actually come in today. I forwarded them off to some principals so that they can review them, get their teams together, and actively start interviewing and get some of these positions filled as soon as possible. I'm going to do my best in the short amount of time that I'm here to use my skills that I've acquired in the past and get some teachers in these seats instead of substitutes.

Comm. Mimms: I have two concerns. You talked about the fair. You mentioned the 17th and the 19th. Those are report card distributions for the schools. I don't know if there will be a conflict with those dates with the administrators being in those fairs. The other point of observation is bringing the signing bonus for the fair, which would be great. The problem is why didn't we know about it prior? It's drafted language in the bargaining agreement. Why wasn't it identified earlier than now? We could have used that as a tool or strategy to bring in some good candidates for the district.

Mr. Rojas: I can't answer that question for you. The only thing I can say is that as soon as we negotiated our contract and it was official, not this past August but August of 2014, I did a presentation at International High School with all our principals present. Everyone got the information. I passed the information along to HR. It was very well communicated. It has been a tool that I don't monitor so I can't tell you why it hasn't been used or if it has been used until now. All I can tell you is as of now I'm making sure that this is actually being promoted and it's a recruitment tool that is at our disposal that we should use to entice some folks into Paterson.

Dr. Evans: I have also addressed it with principals in the monthly meetings that I have with them and so principals have known.

Comm. Cleaves: How does the signing bonus affect or reflect on our budget?

Dr. Evans: Good question. There is a cost. It's a priority, so giving it means we're not going to do something else. But I don't know anything else more important than having qualified staff in our classrooms. I'm willing to cut and I've made it available.

Comm. Hodges: How will you determine what you're going to cut? Let's be very blunt about this. The plan is to flat fund the district next year. There is no conversation. So if we were \$72 million short-funded last year that number is going to be up over \$100 million. And, by the way, we have to respond to whatever the PARCC data says we're supposed to respond to and at the same time do something about our facilities to make sure that we're maintaining them in a reasonable fashion. These competing priorities are going to be a major challenge. I guess I need to know how you will determine what

you're going to cut in response to this. How many of these teachers are you going to have to do this for?

Dr. Evans: You're asking me a question I can't answer right now. It wouldn't take me long to figure it out, though. We have just under \$100 million in centrally located staff and non-staff funds that are the primary target. This will not be the first time we've had to reduce something since the beginning of this year to provide something else. That is the budget I look at. Not the school budgets, but central administration.

Comm. Kerr: With all of that thinking, Dr. Evans, does the state still have the same expectation of the district to deliver the same benchmark results that they're requiring us to deliver?

Dr. Evans: The same obligation to meet T&E, thorough and efficient education, exists.

Comm. Kerr: With that kind of cut?

Dr. Evans: Big or small, we are required to deliver services consistent with providing a thorough and efficient education.

Comm. Kerr: Isn't there disconnect here, Dr. Evans? Isn't there something to be represented to them telling them it's unrealistic? Or are you telling them, "I'll see what I can do"?

Dr. Evans: I'm responding to the direction that I've been given and the needs that I see in the district.

Comm. Kerr: To me it's a matter of not clearly expressing to them what's not doable. You come to a point where you need to say this is not doable. It's not a practical matter. You can't be cutting the district beyond what's reasonable.

Dr. Evans: Mr. Kerr, we've had these conversations. I'm not going to get into the specifics, but we've had those conversations.

Comm. Kerr: I'm not saying you should, but something has to be said and done to register our concerns. Dr. Evans, I can't tell you or dictate to you what to do, but this is something that I know is going to hurt a lot of kids in this district. I'm troubled and I'm worried about that. Everywhere else they'll tell you they need the resources. That's our delivery system. That's an essential part of the delivery system of the district and if they're taking away from you how can they demand of us the same level of output. It just doesn't make sense and we have to do something.

Comm. Mimms: We have the fluctuation as you stated with the numbers. The list we got was 51 and even with the fluctuation the list had 5 at School 21, but the data we received is 6. I don't know if it's fluctuation or just misinformation. I don't know which of the two. The list we got had 5, but on this sheet there are 6. That's one point of reference. The other concern I have, which is bigger, is that we have identified in our district these vacancies and they are in our Tier I, Tier II, and Priority Schools. We have eight specifically in our Priority Schools, 15 in our Tier II schools, 4 in Tier I, and then 24 if you combine the high schools, Newcomers, and leadership. If we're expecting our children to succeed, how can they succeed when we don't have the instructors in place to push it? Number two, what types of grades are our children going to get for the first marking period when the marking period ends next week and they have not had instructors since September? I'm speaking because I've talked to various parents in

School 21. I went to the school and spoke to those parents. In the beginning of the school year those students received schedules with question marks on them. Not a class or a subject, but question marks from the beginning of the school year. What they've been doing is having substitutes come and go and they're not consistent. Some of the students are receiving packets. If that's been their instruction from September, what types of grades are these kids going to receive in their report cards on November 17? And how is it fair to our children in this district when they begin looking at grades to pull them in for schools like Tech and other academies? They're looking at them from seventh grade. How fair is that to our children? We don't have things effectively in place but then you look at some of the schools and they have their teachers in place. How did some schools miss it and other principals not miss it? It's a point of observation that we not just depend on the principals to make sure that the positions are filled. We have to micromanage until we make sure that we have the best and the brightest, that we make sure that we have the instructors in place so when the teachers walk in the building and our kids walk in in September when they sit in the class there is someone giving true instruction. That's going to be a serious concern when I go to back-to-school night on November and I look at the report cards. There should not be a C, a D, and there dare not be an F on anyone's report card when there have not been instructors in the classrooms. They've had substitutes. Substitutes have left. I'm not just speaking for School 21. This is across the board for all these schools. Then we have a plethora of bilingual instructors that we're missing. I'm not sure if we need to do something a little different or make sure that we read the fine print. Like you saw with the bargaining agreement, we can do signing bonuses and that type of thing. That should have been something that's been identified. We have to find ways to close the gap in the district. We have to identify who's in our district that does what they do. If you're good at HR, we need to have you on fast track. If we have someone that's shifting we need to have an eye on that person. Whatever needs to be done so we can make sure that for the next school year we don't have the issues that we have this year! Budget is one thing. But when you don't have teachers in place when we've let go 335 people, it's a sad state for the Paterson Board of Education.

Dr. Evans: If I may ask Mr. Rojas a question, what is the number of vacancies? You mentioned November 2. What was the count on that day?

Mr. Rojas: I don't remember the exact count, but when we were meeting there were two different tasks. The one was a vacancy list. There were five at the time for School 21. The six that you received is the status of the vacancies that we had at School 21. I gave you an additional one on the status report which showed that while it was a vacancy at one point in recent history last week or so the additional one just shows that we did hire someone. You show an extra person on there and that's because we hired that person.

Dr. Evans: The reason for my asking the question is that at any given point in time we are short anywhere from 30 to 40 classroom teachers every day. The areas most impacted are the critical shortage areas, the areas where there aren't applicants, not just for Paterson, but for the nation. Whether it's elsewhere in New Jersey or across the country, there is a shortage of the higher level math teachers, the higher level science teachers, special education teachers, and ELL teachers. The universities and colleges are not producing enough for us to fill the need across the state and nation. You can go back and look in time as far back as you want and you will see in Paterson an average of 30 to 40 vacancies on any given day and 75% to 80% of those vacancies are in those critical shortage areas. That's a reality that the nation faces and it's a reality that we face. The last count I saw was 60 to 65, which is above that average. That's an even bigger problem. But the point is we are doing an awful lot and I appreciate the work that

Mr. Rojas is doing. Ms. McKoy was doing the same and was following that same suit in terms of making sure that if there was an applicant out there we aggressively were going after them in ways that the district hasn't in years because of the challenges. We need to be even more aggressive. That's one of the reasons why we pushed so hard with the PEA to get that provision in the contract. It's called a signing bonus. It's actually an extra bonus for people going into hard-to-fill position. That's literally what it is. Or the second one was for a turnaround school. Those are two provisions that we pushed to get in the contract to address that problem. I don't want to confuse the norm, which is on average 30 to 40 teachers in areas where there just aren't any, as compared to us now and we are above that right now.

Comm. Irving: Dr. Evans has a great point. In any given year we typically do see dozens of vacancies. In my opinion that doesn't mean the norm is acceptable. 30 or 40 to me is still unacceptable. My recommendation and suggestion would be for the human resources team to get together and put together a benchmark for how we're going to reduce the number of vacancies by a time period and the plan to do so. Maybe it's the fairs. Maybe it's reaching out to the education departments. It might be finding student teachers who need to begin their practicum at a certain point in time. There's an extra step that we have to go to. Given the constant flux of human resources in this district we're not going to achieve that unless a group of well-meaning administrators sit down together and say, "We have 60. How do we get down to 30?" It's comprehensive, clear, and gets brought back to the Board so we can measure that. Comm. Mimms is correct. If we get to December and we still have 60 vacancies we've failed our kids. There is nothing short of that. I just don't want to jump on the train and banter. Someone needs to get together in the next two or three days and come up with a plan for how we're going to reduce that.

Dr. Evans: We actually have done that. In our past two cabinet meetings that has been the focus and we do have some suggestions. It's taking some people in less critical positions who are certified teachers and putting them in some of those vacancies to teach until we are able to hire some additional ones. That's an example of a strategy that we're ready to do. Take some of those supervisors we're talking about who are highly qualified teachers and put them in the classroom until we can get a teacher. It's that kind of example that we just recently had discussions about.

Comm. Irving: I support that, but what I'm asking for is something written. Your conversation with your cabinet is not your conversation with this Board. I think the Board is owed the opportunity to measure and evaluate the process by which you all plan to reduce this number. That's a great suggestion. By the next Board meeting we should know that these supervisors have now moved into classrooms temporarily until we fill the positions. They may not be happy, but it is what it is. I think before we get to the next Board meeting my expectation is there has to be a plan. That needs to be shepherded by you, but also by the assistant superintendents of respective departments who are then working with the principals saying, "You have to find somebody." I'll be very frank with you. We're at a point in time in the year where we are probably not going to find the cat's meow. It is a harsh reality. I've had this debate even in my classes with folks. When you come midyear, what do you do? Do you leave a position vacant? Or do you take someone who is decent and might have promise or decent who doesn't have promise? I'm saying at this point in time we just need somebody certified and qualified to teach our kids. You can't be picky at this point in time. I want to be sure our principals understand that notion. They may find folks who may not be the best fit, but if we keep passing, there's going to be no one left in the pool.

Comm. Hodges: I know you're not suggesting that we deviate from the state promulgated evaluation program and do anything that's less than consistent and objective. I know that's not what you're suggesting.

Comm. Irving: I don't know what the hell you just said.

Comm. Hodges: He does. He knows exactly what I said. How many Sped teachers were RIF'd?

Mr. Rojas: Off the top of my head I have no idea.

Comm. Hodges: We did RIF teachers who were in a critical need area.

Dr. Evans: There's more to that picture that I'm not willing to discuss in public. I'll discuss it with you in private. There's a lot more to that picture.

Comm. Hodges: These are critical need areas and unfortunately I don't know what you do. We'll discuss that offline. Any plan that Mr. Irving talked about should be reviewed by the personnel committee, vetted, and then presented to the Board as part of that process.

Dr. Evans: We will prepare it for the personnel committee.

Comm. Hodges: Are we looking at incentive programs for teachers and partnerships with schools to try to boost the numbers?

Dr. Evans: Yes.

Comm. Hodges: Those are some of the other areas.

Mr. Rojas: I've contacted colleagues in other school districts that I know, other human resources departments to see if they have extra résumés hanging around, folks that they haven't used, or some of the databases of résumés that they've collected throughout the year to send them my way. Those phone calls were made today as well. Every day there's a different tactic going on to try to do something different and get some folks in.

Comm. Hodges: Finally, Mr. Kerr, Dr. Evans is not going to say publicly that the money that we received is inadequate. He's not going to say that because the state's position is the money is adequate.

Comm. Kerr: Dr. Evans is right, but I have a right also to make the point.

Comm. Hodges: Your point is valid and you're putting it on the record. I'm just making it very clear that the conditions that exist in this district right now are detrimental to the educational improvement of our children and I'm prepared to write a letter stating that fact based on what I'm seeing with special education teachers and other teachers not in the classroom for months at a time. I'm putting it out there to get a response because what's going to happen next year when the cuts come and we have to lay off science, math, and special education teachers and lose quality people only to bring them back in September and October again? That's unacceptable and should be legally sanctioned because this cannot continue. We're dismantling this school district bit by bit. We can't sit back and say nothing about it. That's what I wanted to say.

Comm. Kerr: What I'm going to say is simply this – to know that a need exists is not strategic. To know how to prevent it and know how to fix it is strategic. I'm taken aback when Mr. Rojas said that there's knowledge that year after year we have this critical amount of shortage in these areas. If you have that information year after year, what's the plan? If you can't show a plan tonight it means that you were not paying attention to it. You've become very accepting of that situation. The other point I would like to make here is that we have to find a way to fix it, but I need to know if on one hand we have a fiscal problem and on the other hand we also have a needs problem in terms of shortages of teachers in those critical areas. We have a problem finding and locating or developing teachers in those critical areas. We need to know what we're dealing with. When was the RIF?

Dr. Evans: April.

Comm. Kerr: We laid off teachers who were operating in some of these critical areas. That's fiscal to me. It was not about performance. And if we are still short in those critical areas and you're telling me we know and on the other hand you're saying it's not a fiscal matter, what are we saying? That's my problem. What are we saying? We cut people in those areas and to me that is strictly fiscal. Then we are saying on the other hand we know we have those shortages that exist, but it's not fiscal. I just don't understand the process here. You're saying Dr. Evans can't say that, but I can't sit here as a Commissioner on this Board and accept that. If I tell you I accept that I would be doing a big disservice to the children of Paterson and I would also be telling you that I'm prepared to accept foolishness.

Comm. Mimms: I just have a thought. Would there be any way that we can work an incentive out where there are some people on the cusp of taking the praxis exam where we can have an incentive where we can work with the state and we'll cover the fees. That might be another incentive we work around. If someone is right there all they have to do is take the test. Whatever the program is, we'll cover the cost or maybe we'll have some tutorial classes for praxis to get people prepared. That could be a part of the HR team to help people pass.

Comm. Irving: Didn't we do something like that for alternate route? When we had our boom I think I was in grad school at the time. It was like six or seven years ago. Everybody was going through alternate route.

Mr. Rojas: And we were paying for the fees.

Comm. Irving: Right.

Mr. Rojas: We stopped doing that several years ago.

Comm. Irving: In two weeks when we get back together there just has to be something that Dr. Evans or you present to the Board that says here's how we're going to reduce this by 50% over the next two to three months. Here's how we're going to reduce this by 60%. We're working with x, y, and z. Here are the suggestions we're doing. It's probably going to be a temporal situation, but desperate times call for desperate measures. Unfortunately, our parents in these schools aren't aggravated enough to come here, but that's why we're here, to advocate on their behalf. I just think in fairness to you and to all the new staff that's on board, this is a very critical and important issue.

Mr. Rojas: I take it seriously. This is not just because I've been here a week and I'm going to fall on that and this is not my problem. It is. We have started out a process to

get that going. We've reached out to colleges. I don't know if you heard before, we have called William Paterson. We have called Jersey City University. We're making those connections with Kean. There are teaching colleges and they're getting us some of those recruits and alumni that they have sitting around. As I was saying before, we've reached out to some of my HR folks and colleagues, specifically in Elizabeth. We have made those phone calls, making those connections internally. Going back to basics, we're putting up some fresh postings. We had some stagnant résumés out there, folks that have taken on positions and moved on. To be honest with you, I can get some big bang for my buck for the job fair. It's going to be in this room and my goal is to get a few hundred folks through the door. Out of those few hundred folks if I can hire 20% that's a huge goal. We're going to offer contacts contingent upon fingerprints and their background investigations and going back to school and presenting their lessons in front of their staff members. We're going to hit this hard and my goal hopefully by the next Board meeting is to be able to give you an update of where we've knocked that down. We do have a plan, but it's not written. I could easily do that for you.

Comm. Cleaves: I agree with Comm. Irving, Dr. Evans. He said parents may not think this is critical enough, but we have teachers who think this is critical enough. I don't want the teacher from School 21 to come back to the meeting and our answer to her is we're working on it. We need to be able to give to her something tangible to walk away with.

Dr. Evans: We will. I just want to underscore two major points that I don't want to get lost here. My first comment is not one of those points. Yes, we have a serious problem. No doubt about it. But point number one, colleges and universities are not producing enough teachers in these critical areas. That's why every year, year in and year out, you hear about vacancies that linger in special education and a lot of the related services such as occupational therapy, physical therapy, the higher level sciences and math. Colleges and universities simply are not producing enough. In some cases it's intentional. I have a stepdaughter that's getting a degree in occupational therapy. She has offers from all across the country from places that don't have occupational therapies to come and do what needs to be done. That's a reality. They purposefully limit the number of people that go through and get that certification to be able to generate higher salaries. If you ask any of the people in the organizations for those fields they will tell you that. But that's point number one. Point number two, we don't have a written plan but we will. One of the key elements of the plan William Paterson just put in place for us a program to train English language learner teachers and supply us with them. Montclair is doing the same with special education, preparing special education certified teachers for us. We don't talk about those things, but we are doing that. You'll see those as elements of the plan that we are going to write out and give to you.

Comm. Rivera: I heard a lot of good points here tonight but I also want to emphasize if I'm a teacher and I continue to hear from my colleges or from the Board members here that the district is looking in bad shape next year with potential cuts, do you think I'm going to be coming to Paterson to teach? We know the situation that we're in. We were in this situation when the year started. We let go of a lot of people. Guess what? We still need teachers. You need a teacher in every classroom. It doesn't matter what your budget is. Let's stop sending the message out there that we're going to have to face some cuts next year. Yes, it's the reality, but if you're an applicant and you're doing your homework and research about the district and you see that we're in a very bad financial situation, do you think that person is going to come here? The only person who's going to come here is the person that hasn't received any offers from anyone. Do

you think you're going to keep the teachers that you currently have that are non-tenured? If I'm a teacher right now and I have a family to feed and I hear this all the time and seeing what happened at the end of this last fiscal year, don't you think I'm going to start looking for places to go? That's why it fluctuates so much. If the district is in the shape that it's in and you continue to send a message that we're going to be facing potential cuts next year again, I just don't see why they would stick around. Please let's cut that out. We can cry all the time the state, the state, the state. Yes, I agree. The state needs to give us more funding. But we've already said enough. We don't have to do it publicly here all the time. That's just my opinion as a Board member.

Comm. Cleaves: That ends my report.

Comm. Hodges: I do have one more point to make, Dr. Evans. We RIF'd 360 administrators because of a financial problem. Next year we're going to be in the same exact position and so the question then becomes how we handle that if we're going to potentially face this kind of teaching crisis. How do we go ahead and RIF people in the future if we know that we won't be able to provide appropriate services without dramatically increasing the class size in the school district? That's what we have to talk about because the finances aren't going to get any better. To Mr. Kerr's point, how are you going to do this? We RIF'd those teachers. We RIF'd the people that we educated and trained, who are now out in Montclair because they snapped them up like crazy and other places that said they'd take them because they're trained. Then we turn around after putting more money into them with IFL. We spent millions of dollars for training and let them go. Now we're hiring back people who don't have that training and next year when we're short funding again we're right back here with another RIF of people that we can't afford to let go. That's the point I wanted to make. How do we do that? That speaks to Mr. Kerr's issue in terms of what happens. We created this problem with our plans because of the funding. So you can't simply say the funding is not a problem. It is a funding problem because you had to lay them off and you're going to have to do it again next year.

Comm. Rivera: Is there any way that we can start looking at other areas now other than personnel where we could possibly next year get from some of those other areas that we've been spending money on?

Dr. Evans: Yes.

Comm. Rivera: Can we start now?

Dr. Evans: We actually already have. We've already started looking. We haven't done anything, but we've started looking. The other thing is I'm going to ask Ms. Shafer to expedite a report that I know she's been working on that shows the number of people that we RIF'd and how many of them are back in the system. You may be surprised.

Comm. Irving: And we may not. Let's keep the door open.

Dr. Evans: I'm really focusing on classroom teachers.

Comm. Hodges: 72%-80% of the entire school district budget is personnel. Of all the money we spend, 72% is personnel. It's all the instruction. Personnel will be your goldmine where you go first.

OTHER BUSINESS

MOTION TO GO INTO EXECUTIVE SESSION TO DISCUSS POSSIBLE LITIGATION AND PERSONNEL

It was moved by Comm. Cleaves, seconded by Comm. Irving that the Board goes into executive session to discuss possible litigation and personnel. On roll call all members voted in the affirmative, except Comm. Cleaves who voted no. The motion carried.

The Board went into executive session at 8:55 p.m.

The Board reconvened the meeting at 10:45 p.m.

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

The meeting was adjourned at 10:46 p.m.