

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

June 4, 2014 . 6:38 p.m.
Administrative Offices

Presiding: Comm. Christopher Irving, President

Present:

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

Comm. Chrystal Cleaves, Vice President
Comm. Wendy Guzman
Comm. Jonathan Hodges
Comm. Errol Kerr

Comm. Manuel Martinez
Comm. Alex Mendez
Comm. Kenneth Simmons
Comm. Corey Teague

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

Comm. Martinez 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
June 4, 2014 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.

Comm. Irving: I want to thank everyone for coming this evening. I just want to share again the news that was announced this morning by the State Department of Education which granted the return of the local control area of operations to the Paterson Public School Board. I want to publicly as I said before and also now at our meeting extend to my colleagues your sincere thanks for your leadership. Over the last year and a half, I've gone to you all and asked you to work with me and the state in getting us to this very important first step of a much longer process. I appreciate all your continued support as we move forward together. I just want you tell you guys sincerely thank you for your hard work and all the work that you guys have done. With that said, we do have a pretty packed agenda tonight. There is going to be one more addition of a

presentation and that's going to be a report from the Full Service Community Schools and the status of that. We're going to discuss the internal audit findings, G&T program evaluation, bilingual middle grades program reorg, and then we'll have Tobi Knehr come forward to discuss the presentation on the Full Service Community Schools. To that end, I will ask each presenter I know you all have PowerPoint presentations and all this great stuff, but if you can keep your information and report to 10 minutes that would be great. At least that allows for the Board to ask quality questions. So please be brief, be concise, and after we're done with questions be gone. We mean nothing bad by it.

PRESENTATIONS AND COMMUNICATIONS

Discussion on Internal Audit Report Findings on Early Childhood Providers A Whole New World Preschool and Innovative Educational Programs Learning Center for the 2012-2013 Fiscal Year

Dr. Evans: We have three presentations that will be presented or led by Ms. Peron or members of her staff, in one case the consultant that actually conducted a program evaluation for us. So I'll call on Ms. Peron to lead us through those three.

Ms. Susana Peron: Good evening everyone. At this time, I will call Nancy Aguado-Holtje, the Director of Early Childhood, so that she can take us through the two report audits.

Ms. Nancy Aguado-Holtje: Good evening. The Paterson Internal Audit conducted an audit of *Innovative Educational Programs Learning Center*, a provider participating in the New Jersey Department of Education Preschool Education Program, for compliance with the terms of the contract for the 2012-2013 fiscal year. *IEP Learning Center* is a childcare center providing services to the children of Paterson, New Jersey. The provider is a for-profit organization. It has two locations. *IEP Learning Center I* consists of 14 classrooms and is located at 30 Michigan Avenue. *IEP Learning Center II* consists of two classrooms and is located at 277 6th Avenue. The provider was budgeted to serve a total of 240 Department of Education children. The approved budget totaled \$2,772,839. It should be noted that it was one combined budget for both locations. As a result of the audit, three deficiencies were noted, which I will identify and provide our corrective action and method of implementation. Finding number one . the provider underspent the budget by \$144,722.87. The corrective action plan is the district will recover this amount from the provider and we will reduce the tuition payments to the provider as our method of implementation. Finding number two . the auditors noted minor unallowable expenditures. The corrective action plan is that we will direct the provider to implement fiscal controls and to charge only allowable costs to the DOE program. The method of implementation is the district will continue to review the general ledger and expenditure report to ensure accounting controls are in place. The third finding . the auditors noted minor accounting and recordkeeping irregularities. Again, the district will direct the provider to implement sound fiscal controls to eliminate these accounting errors and we will continue to review the general ledger and the self-review to ensure that accounting controls are in place. That concludes my presentation for *IEP Learning Center*. The Paterson Internal Audit conducted an audit of *A Whole New World Preschool*, a provider participating in the New Jersey Department of Education Preschool Education Program for compliance with the terms of the contract for the 2012-2013 fiscal year. *A Whole New World Preschool* is a non-profit childcare center providing services to the children of Paterson. The center is located at 624 East 29th Street in Paterson. It was budgeted to serve a total of 75 children. The approved budget for 2012-2013 was \$976,840. As a result of the audit, five deficiencies were noted which I will identify and provide our corrective action and method of

implementation. Finding number one . the provider underspent the budget by \$129,836.89. The district will recover \$84,332.60 by June of 2014. After that the Department of Early Childhood will refer collection of \$45,504.40 to the legal department. The method of implementation would be collection of funds will be referred to the legal department of Paterson Public Schools. Finding number two . the provider did not provide health benefits for employees for July, August, and September of 2012. The corrective action plan as well as the method of implementation is we will no longer direct the provider because we are no longer going to be in collaboration with this provider as of 2014 fiscal year end. Finding number three . the provider failed to produce evidence of workman's compensation insurance coverage. The center will not be collaborating with us so there will be no corrective action plan. Finding number four . the auditors noted minor unallowable expenditures and the same goes for finding number five. The auditors noted minor accounting and recordkeeping irregularities. That concludes *A Whole New World Preschool*.

Comm. Irving: They underspent by \$129,000 and we're only recouping \$84,000. Why the difference?

Ms. Aguado-Holtje: We recoup up to the end of this year because it's taken from their monthly payments. So we need to make sure that they can make payroll and all the benefits until the end of the school year.

Comm. Irving: Got it. So after the fact, we have to

Ms. Aguado-Holtje: We have to refer it to legal.

Comm. Irving: Lisa, please keep us apprised of that because I want it to be very transparent as we go through that process. I want to bring this Board back to the time when there was another provider who did indeed. Well, I don't want to talk about it now. How we adjudicate and ask for those funds back has been dealt with differently depending on the provider. That's all I'm going to say. Just keep us in the loop for when that comes up because there is something in executive session I want to share about that. It's not always consistent in how we deal with that.

Comm. Cleaves: Is it possible that we could have copies of your audit?

Ms. Aguado-Holtje: It will be on the website. It's in your packet and it's detailed. It's under the action.

Ms. Peron: It's C-10 and C-11.

Ms. Aguado-Holtje: You can see how it was broken down.

Comm. Irving: Thank you very much. Nancy, great job in modeling!

Gifted and Talented Program Evaluation

Ms. Peron: Our second presentation for Early Childhood and Special Programs is the program evaluation for Gifted & Talented. When we began that initiative, we promised the Board that we would come back at the end of the second year with a program evaluation. Tonight, we have Dr. Elissa Brown who is an adjunct professor at Rutgers University and a distinguished lecturer and director of the Hunter College Center for Gifted Education. Previously, she was the Director of Teacher and Leader Education Programs and Statewide Secondary Projects at the North Carolina Department of

Public Instruction. She has served as a State Director of Gifted Programs in North Carolina and she is here with us tonight to present her evaluation methods and her findings and recommendations for the Gifted & Talented Program.

Dr. Elissa Brown: Good evening. Thank you. Congratulations on your huge announcements and accomplishments today. Very impressive! I'm just going to share with you my external evaluation audit of the Paterson Academy for the Gifted & Talented. There is a PowerPoint as well as an executive summary. I just want to frame this within the context of local and state. This is your, as you're very aware, district priorities and so this is nested under the first one around effective academic programs. This is from the New Jersey State Administrative Code and this is the definition that New Jersey employs in gifted education. What you'll find interesting about this definition is it talks about students who possess or demonstrate high levels of ability in one or more content areas when compared to chronological peers in the local district. This is around local norms. Then the rest of the statement talks about they require modification of their educational program in order to meet their potential. So it's not suggested or it would be nice . they require it. These are the four guiding principles that I used when I conducted the evaluation and I've done several external evaluations around the country for school systems. For me, it has to be purposeful, efficient, and economical. It's important that it's conducted competently and ethically. Lastly, it should drive program improvement. So the purposes of the audit are twofold. One is to document strengths and limitations. The second is to suggest recommendations based on the findings. The approaches that I use to look at the data . I looked at district context and had conversations about that, I looked at your website so I can get contextually the important local uniqueness of Paterson, I looked at your goals and needs, and then from that formulated research questions in collaboration with Rutgers and district personnel. My data approaches were stakeholder input, both focus groups and interviews with parents, teachers, and administrators. I did classroom observations, document reviews, and looked at student data. So it was both qualitative and quantitative in terms of data sources and methods. This kind of just lays out conceptually the bigger picture looking at the inputs, how Paterson thinks about gifted kids, what they use for identification. I was interested in the curriculum instruction and assessment. In order to drill down and look at those components, I looked at observations, focus groups, interviews to get at what is happening in the classroom with those kids, and then the output is the action planning and the recommendations. This was the scope. I started in January and then I finished in April. I came and I did nine classroom observations at the Paterson Academy. I observed every classroom in grades 4-8. I held three focus group sessions with a total of 25 members. I did three interviews with a total of four individuals. Then I looked at 2011-2012 NJASK student data results and I reviewed documents. I looked at curriculum units, any advertising, communications, memos, and PowerPoints. These were the research questions. I'm not going to read all of these to you. You have these, but you can see how they honor the methods and the local context. The most important one to point out is how effective is the program in meeting both the academic and social/emotional, the affective needs of gifted. Then the last one I think you might find interesting, the impact that PAGT has had on the local district. I wanted to show you just a quick slide around demographics. This is one of the criticisms that is leveled against gifted programs around the country, that gifted programs typically don't mirror the district demographics. Yours does. So if you take a look at this you've got 63% of Paterson Public Schools as Hispanic and in the Paterson Academy for Gifted & Talented it's 61%. On down through it is 26% Black, 21%, 6% Caucasian, 5%. So the demographics of the students being served mirror the local demographics of Paterson Public Schools and that's commendable. That really speaks highly to the identification process and the strategic way in which they're garnering the potential of students. So I'm just going to share with you a couple of key

findings and some graphs. You've got the executive summary. If you want any more data or the full narrative which supports this, the full report can be made available to you. One of the things I did is I went in the classrooms and observed because it's important to look at the learning process and see if these kids are being challenged. I used a protocol that's been normed, valid, and reliable in terms of looking at differentiation. It's very complimentary to this evaluation system you use and I was specifically looking at effective teaching and effective teachers of the gifted. So it has six categories . curriculum planning & delivery, which comes out of the literature around effective teachers. Effective teachers plan, deliver, they're strategic, and they hold high expectations. Accommodating individual differences is really critical when you talk about gifted kids. Problem solving is PS, critical thinking, creative thinking, and research strategies. On the observation protocol I used it's a rating scale of 1-3. So you can see categorically that the teachers at PAGT were very high or above the mean in terms of curriculum planning and delivery, accommodating individual differences, and lower on problem-solving and research strategies. That really just speaks to that there were nine classrooms. So it was a small sample size. Then for each category there are different elements of those categories. I looked at those. This is just an example for the one curriculum planning and delivery. Under that category there are different probes or behaviors I was looking for. This kind of breaks down how the mean score fell out. Setting high expectations, incorporating activities to apply new knowledge, having students reflect on what they learned, having them engaged in planning, monitoring, and expressing their thoughts. All of that are facets and elements of effective curriculum planning and delivery. Your student trend data for the academy, this is kind of interesting. If you look across the two years of data, if you look at proficient to above proficient you'll notice that in 2012-2013 in language arts in proficient went from 97% to 89.6% but that's because there was an increase in advanced proficient. They increased from 3% to 10.4%, which is huge. It's very difficult with gifted kids sometimes to show growth because they hit the ceiling. So to show growth with gifted kids is huge. In math they went from 20.2% proficient to 17.6% proficient. But again, because there was more in the above proficient they went from 79.8% in math to 82.4% in math. Then this shows of the students that attend PAGT perfect scores in math. They have hit the ceiling in the NJASK. There were 17 students in 2012. 13% of the population there scored perfect in math on the scale score of 300 and then in 2013 more than a quarter of those students, 25.6% of those students scored perfect in math. Then qualitatively some of the quotes that emerged from doing the different focus groups. I'm just going to point out two of them for you. One of the parents said about her son attending PAGT, %He has learned a lot more this year than he did two years ago in another school. He knows he has to work hard for it. He's still adjusting, but he's not giving up.+ This really speaks to the level of challenge that these kids are experiencing. Then a student said, %We're in an environment where we can learn. I feel as if I belong in this school.+ There's some interesting research about gifted kids being with other gifted kids and feeling like they're not the only one asking questions and feeling at home there. Then there are some other quotes there that really exemplify some of the findings. So I've got two slides around findings, two slides around commendations, and two slides around recommendations. These are some of the key findings. There are more in the full report. I don't want to read all these to you. There's one around social/emotional needs. That is being met somewhat, but some more work needs to be done around that. It fosters a positive environment where these kids can be with like-ability peers. Further documentation of program effectiveness needs to occur. There's mixed public perceptions and some parent reluctance about the enrollment due to the location and then the personnel response quickly as needs arise. So as different questions and needs rise there's a rapid response. It's academically challenging. I heard that again and again. Students complete many projects, but sometimes the demands of multiple projects and homework take a toll on students and parents. Identification system is

finding the right kids for that program. The personnel is enthusiastic, accessible, committed and dedicated. There are vehicles in place for communication. The program has been in place two years so the fact that it's up and operational and you even have the foresight this early to do a program evaluation is tremendous. Professional development still needs to occur for multiple stakeholders, both for the teachers within the building, principals across the district, counselors, and other personnel. There's an initial infrastructure. You've got a program in place. Demographics of the students served mirror the local demographics. You've got personnel that are committed and dedicated. They use integrated curriculum units which have been developed and implemented and that speaks to best practices for gifted. There's a district-wide recognition that these kids need to be served. Efforts made in the last two years to broaden the program access both in terms of increasing the grade levels, but also changing the identification system a little bit and increasing parent and teacher outreach and awareness. Showcasing the program - I know you've had a lot of external folks come in from other districts to look. It's a very unique program in New Jersey. There are not many gifted schools. So there's a lot of interest in knowing what you're doing and being able to replicate that in other parts of the state. Teacher requirement to complete specialized course work is not only commendable but appropriate. You're working with a special needs population and the teachers there need to have specific course work. Then there's stakeholder recognition. It is providing something for students that the home school is not. Recommendations: increasing public relations and communications, better coordination of the projects and assignments within and across, ownership of the students. Is it a program? Is it a school? What happens with these kids? Then professional development for multiple stakeholders needs to occur. Creating a system to follow these kids in their trajectory so when they leave PAGT at eighth grade, where are they going and how are their needs being met? Even the incoming, your k-1 and 2, take a look at that as a systemic k-12 system. Formalizing a program to meet the social/emotional needs - there's a lot of literature around that the social/emotional needs of gifted kids around perfectionism and peer pressure can be intense and more needs to be done in that area. Continued support of the program by the district so that it's sustainable - parents need to know this is not just something that's here for three years and then we're not. Guidelines, procedures, and policies need to be in place to allow for transparency, consistency, and fluidity. There's additional contact information. I want to commend Rita Route and Susie Peron for providing data and being accessible. I want to commend Dr. Evans who has been the leader behind this and an advocate for gifted. It really speaks highly when you have a Superintendent really thinking about all the students and raising everybody's level of achievement, including those with gifts and talents. And then I want to commend Rutgers University who was a partner in this. I just want to end with a quote from Chester Finn. He's the President of the Thomas B. Fordham Institute. It's interesting to think about his notion around gifted. Collateral victims are a society and economy that thereby fail to make the most of latent human capital. It's not elitist to pour more resources into educating our brightest kids. In fact, the future of the country may depend on it. So he's really talking about the economic impact to society around educating these students. I want to thank you for allowing me the opportunity to present some thoughts and I'm happy to take any questions.

Comm. Irving: Maybe Ms. Route might be available as well if they follow the scope of the presentation that happens to be here. I have two questions, but I'll yield to anyone else. The first question I have is probably for Rita more than anyone else. What's the current student population at the school?

Ms. Rita Route: 155 for grades 4-8 currently.

Comm. Irving: Are there plans to increase that student population?

Ms. Route: We just sent out 90 acceptance letters for September, including grades 2-3.

Comm. Irving: So next year we'll go from 2-8.

Ms. Route: That's the hope.

Comm. Irving: How many students will that brings us to next year?

Ms. Route: Almost 250. Maybe a couple more as we go.

Comm. Irving: Given the recommendations of the external evaluator, Dr. Brown, is there an action plan that you're putting together in response to this?

Ms. Route: Yes. She's going to come back and do PD with our staff again in the areas that we're a little low on. She's already given me recommendations that we can do as far as publicity, improving our identification plans and things like that.

Ms. Peron: Each item of recommendation we're going to take them and we're going to develop an implementation action and timeline.

Comm. Irving: Can the Board have that once it's done?

Ms. Peron: Yes.

Comm. Irving: Thank you. If you could have it before the start of the school year, that would be fantastic. Dr. Evans, this is a prime example of how we document effective programs we implement. We put them in place, we evaluate them, and we figure out whether they're doing well. I'm glad we're doing whether or not it is, but there's a level of accountability in coming back to the Board and sharing that information. I think that this type of process needs to happen with other programs, case in point SIG, case in point the Community Schools Initiative, case in point some of the other initiatives that we happen to interject such as IFL, on a more regular basis. I just want to commend everyone for coming back and really sharing this information.

Comm. Teague: I just want to say that I'm very impressed with the presentation. I was following you actually. I wasn't reading it from the screen. I'm very impressed. I feel that it was thorough and I'm very satisfied with it. I just want to let you know that.

Dr. Brown: I appreciate the opportunity and it was really interesting to look at both hard evidence and observations and then take that until you get a point called data saturation and you can just say I'm seeing this in multiple ways so this is clearly an area. I did want to mention usually I offer with any district to come back and help them do action planning to set short-term and long-term goals with the expectation that they then provide annual updates or whatever to the Board of how they're implementing against those.

Comm. Hodges: Quite frankly, all of our programs need that examination because, as I'm finding out at this task force, that's going on in other districts. So it's helpful to start that up and it will be good news for you, Dr. Evans. I was trying to understand in particular the two areas that you said were problematic. You gave a brief explanation of why there was this drop-off. I'd like a clearer explanation.

Dr. Brown: What I used was a classroom observation scale revised. It's a validated instrument to look at teacher behaviors with gifted kids. The six areas are from the research that they say is research-based evidence in terms of gifted. The teachers of the gifted and I would argue that all teachers need to be asking critical thinking skills and creative thinking skills, and those sorts of things. It's a scale of 1-3. 1 is ineffective, 2 is somewhat effective, and 3 is effective. Then there's a category N/O+ which is not observed. I know that going in for 45 minutes I'm seeing a snapshot and I may not see all those different elements occur within 45 minutes. So I think what they're seeing is through doing multiple classroom observations by and large the teachers over there are very strong in curriculum planning and delivery, which is great because they're setting high expectations. They're accommodating individual differences through projects and assignments so they're differentiating. They're doing problem-solving. It's not that they're not doing it. I saw it. I just didn't see it as frequently. But again, that's maybe because I only saw 45 minutes on a certain day. Maybe if I came back the next day I would see more of it.

Comm. Hodges: But you would think that if you were able to see the other items you might over time

Dr. Brown: Right. It also has to do with the elements underneath problem-solving. I was looking for very specific things under that category. The other point I made is that I only saw nine classrooms. So if you have a couple of effectives and one ineffective it's going to skew. Only seeing nine classrooms is going to impact the mean. Going back to your point about action planning, it also helps drive some of the direction for next year. So when they think about professional development and targeted professional development for that staff we can work on problem-solving or research strategies.

Comm. Hodges: The reason I'm so concerned about those two, particularly the projects, is because I'd like to see more of that here.

Dr. Brown: They're doing it. It's not saying they're not. I didn't see as strong as evidence, but that's not to say they're not doing it. It could be an area that we target for next year.

Comm. Hodges: Thank you.

Comm. Mendez: I want to congratulate you for the presentation. It was great and it was a lot of information. I see that the enrollment is increasing every year at the Gifted & Talented Academy. What type of challenge do you think we're facing in terms of facilities? What is the capacity of the building at School 28?

Dr. Brown: I can talk about it programmatically. Somebody else would have to answer the facilities. I think there's enough.

Ms. Peron: The goal is to increase the grade levels. So we're beginning with second and third and then taking a look all the way down to preschool. We do have preschool classrooms in that particular school. The total amount of capacity in that facility for enrollment I'm not quite sure what that number is.

Dr. Evans: I would call on Mr. Sapara-Grant. My recollection is in the neighborhood of 600 to 700 students. Mr. Sapara-Grant would know more.

Mr. Chris Sapara-Grant: 600.

Dr. Evans: For the students that have been identified for next year there is capacity for them. However, after next year we're going to have to look beyond School 28.

Ms. Peron: We've done some configurations of grades there so we're going to keep taking a look at that. But for the number of students that we went out and sent out for them to participate in the program there is enough capacity.

Comm. Mendez: In your presentation you were mentioning how some type of change in the perception of the school in the community. I totally understand that School 28 is not in the best location in Paterson. Do you have any recommendations for the district or any type of campaign to go out there and change the perception of the school in the community?

Dr. Brown: I think you would probably have a better idea around that. Initially my thoughts are the kinds of things you're already doing. By having people go through and maybe by having open houses there with parents so they can see it's fine and kids are happy, and you do that. Continue those kinds of things. I think sometimes location or the building itself is misleading because it's really what happens inside that's important. I think parents sometimes just see a physical location and they make all sorts of assumptions. So I think the degree to which you can get people in there. There might be little things around painting and other things aesthetically. I live in an area in New York that for New Yorkers historically people have been feared. I love it and I say come to East Harlem. It's good. I just think having the program there, building the program there, making it open and accessible.

Ms. Peron: I think the most important piece is not the building, but it's what happens inside the building. I think the most powerful piece was when we opened the doors to parents for the parents to come in and visit and the community. They see what's going on and they changed their perception about location because it's what happens inside. The kids go outside. They're not walking the neighborhood, but we have done some work to the outside of that facility and there is planned work to continue building a playground and a play space for not only School 28 but School 4 and having that whole as a campus and improving that aesthetically for the community and the school. You have to really go there and when you see what happens inside the classroom you really get excited to see what's going on.

Comm. Martinez: What is the criteria by which we determine a student's status as Gifted & Talented? Are they given an examination to determine that status?

Ms. Route: First, we identify students in the district based on their NJASK scores. We create a pool of students who achieve 275 or above on either the math or the language arts section. That's how we create our pool of students. Then we ask the parents if they would allow us to test them. We administer the cognitive ability test or the COGAT, as it's called. It's basically an ability test that tests them on verbal, quantitative, and non-verbal. When those scores come back we take that into account, NJASK, STAR, report cards, teacher recommendations, parent questionnaires, and student questionnaires - so multiple measures. But what we look for on that COGAT is students that score in the 90th percentile or above in at least two of the areas. So we take the students that score in all three, the students who score in only two, the students who score in one, and then the students who score in none. We start with this pile and we work our way down.

Comm. Martinez: Is any consideration given to social/emotional aspects? It's a heavy load at times as you said. In a traditional classroom they may feel ostracized for being the ones who ask those questions. Is there any consideration given to that aspect?

Ms. Route: We have a great guidance counselor in our building this year who has made it a point to work with our students. She's also currently in the cohort with Rutgers. So she'll be taking more classes on how to deal with the students. Our teachers have already taken classes. We have support groups. We have morning meetings. Every day one the whole school comes together in the auditorium where we talk about things like that and the habits of the mind, anxiety, pressure, and all kinds of things like that to address it with the kids. We also have Dr. Pagan. He's a clinical psychologist who's coming in pro-bono and he works with our middle school students. He works with the girls and the boys separately and talks to them about pressures and things like that as well.

Comm. Martinez: Excellent. You guys spoke about expanding the program from 4-8 to 2-8. What about our students who are in the eighth grade who are moving on to high school? How do we address those needs? There's no answer right now I would imagine. But do we have a plan for years down the line where we can perhaps do a Gifted & Talented Academy or something along those lines?

Ms. Route: Ideally our goal is to keep them in-district

Comm. Martinez: So as not to lose them again.

Ms. Route: Dr. Evans is already in the works of International Baccalaureate, which is a very prestigious program we hope to bring into one of the high schools and that will be streamlining our students into that program so they'll want to stay in the district for that.

Comm. Martinez: We want to keep our best and brightest in town.

Dr. Evans: I would also add that the gifted continuum also includes advanced placement. We do have advanced placement in our high schools. So there is a place, but in my opinion it's not enough.

Comm. Simmons: My question is actually along the lines of what Comm. Mendez talked about. In the presentation you talked about location of the building. As Board members, what can we do? We get questioned. As a matter of fact, I just got a text message right before this meeting started about a student who has been accepted to the program. I know you said that you asked parents to come in. Does that happen when the students receive their letter? When does that actually happen?

Ms. Route: When students are identified we send letters home to the parents saying that they have been identified and then we invited them all to an open house to come and see the school to decide whether they wanted to pursue this or not. The door is always open. The parents come all the time. They call. I'm always there anyway. I say come on up and see and usually once they see it then they're accepted.

Ms. Peron: She just gave us a recommendation of having our current students go out to other schools and talk about it. That's a good idea. I don't know if the plans are finalized yet for the summer, but we usually bring in parents in the summer too before the school year starts. We have an open house and an orientation for them. We also do team-building for the students. They come in and they spend hours working with

each other and with teachers to get to know each other and the program. That's on schedule too.

Comm. Simmons: Is the open house after the parent decides?

Ms. Peron: There's one prior and then if they accept they come back.

Comm. Simmons: Okay.

Comm. Hodges: In response to Mr. Mendez's question, Bronx High School of Science isn't in the best place. Neither is Brooklyn Tech. I also will refer you to Columbia University and Johns Hopkins, just to name a few. What you need to do is basically tell people what's going in the building and that will draw them to pass any other considerations. If the building is functioning at a high level they're going to want their kids there. I am concerned it's a five-year process for an IB program to be ratified, three to five. I was told five originally.

Dr. Evans: To be fully ratified yes, but typically two years to develop it and get it operational.

Comm. Hodges: Okay. So we may lose a graduating class to certain schools like Tech and some other places. Have we started that process yet?

Dr. Evans: The IB? Rita is working on it.

Ms. Peron: The International Baccalaureate training begins in July for designated staff in the district. Is that what you asked?

Comm. Hodges: Yes. That's basically it. You're bringing in 2-4?

Ms. Peron: We're adding second and third grades.

Comm. Hodges: Do you anticipate that those students getting this foundation will drive the program into a more rigorous course down the road? I think you're going to have more to work with. I'm alerting you to the potential of that being a necessity. So I'm hoping that you're looking in that direction because these kids are not going to need after two years some of the foundational work that you've done with them. To then give them that same curriculum will be a disservice to them.

Ms. Peron: Correct. Yes. One of the things that the teachers do well is differentiate the curriculum. They look at pacing, acceleration, content, and resources that they use and I think that the earlier we have them the more they're subjected to this different type of teaching and learning. My aim is to get them all the way to preschool and then to expand the academy to a different cohort in a different section of town because I think we need to realize that we're missing Gifted & Talented students. We still have them out there and the academy is small so we need to expand them. By doing that in this location now and having the array, the whole continuum, from pre-k to 8 is the beginning. I do certainly understand your question and I think it's very much taken into consideration in planning the curriculum.

Comm. Hodges: I also suspect or hope that you are planning now to look at another site and beginning the process to train teachers. It has been established that once we give these kids the proper tools and support they excel. As mentioned many times before, we used to have the highest cohort of graduation and the highest GPAs on a

certain university's campus came from Paterson. We stopped the process and I think that if we challenge them more, which is what they complained about on the campus, that we didn't challenge them enough, you're going to have a higher percentage of students who require those programs. So I'm hoping that you are being very proactive in looking for your future choices.

Dr. Evans: We are.

Ms. Peron: I just want to confirm that the Board approved last month or the month before a new cohort for professional development of teachers, administrators, and staff in Paterson Public Schools for the gifted endorsement. So you'd be happy to know that there will be 20 new candidates going through that endorsement program, including administrators.

Comm. Hodges: How many teachers do you have there now?

Ms. Peron: Including administrators. How many teachers do we have in the first cohort? 18. Now we have 20. In the second cohort we have administrators, which is really exciting, and high school.

Bilingual Middle Grades Program Reorganization

Ms. Peron: At this time, I'd like to call the Director of Bilingual Education, Mr. Rogelio Suarez. He will present to you an action implementation from a recommendation that came out of program evaluation as well in 2011. Dr. Evans charged us with evaluating the bilingual program and we had the Institute for Learning come in to review the education program for our English language learners in the Paterson Public Schools. That work was done through the IFL Fellow Dr. Rosita Apodaca. We'd just like to explain to you a small action implementation activity that we were planning on for the fall of reorganization of classrooms. At this time, I will call Mr. Suarez.

Mr. Rogelio Suarez: Thank you, Ms. Peron. Good evening.

Comm. Irving: Hey Rog, do you think you can do this in 10 minutes?

Mr. Suarez: I'll try to do it in less. President Irving, Dr. Evans, Ms. Shafer, Commissioners, thank you for this opportunity to be here to present our proposed restructuring of the bilingual program starting this fall with the middle grades. As Ms. Peron indicated before, roughly a little less than three years ago following our strategic plan specifically Priority I that calls for effective academic programs one of the items was evaluation of programs. Dr. Evans requested the help of the Institute for Learning out of the University of Pittsburgh to come in and conduct a reevaluation of the bilingual program. We helped and assisted Dr. Apodaca. It took several months of work. She interviewed all stakeholders, parents, students, in-school administrators and in central office. Out of that review came a report with four recommendations. The one that pertains to what we're doing, and you have it on your handout, is we needed to design a resource space program for English learners that would provide continuity of service to the English language learners and that can be resourced by the district. If you pass to the next page we really looked at this in two ways. The first was we looked at the data from the last three years of NJASK. I stand here in front of you not proud of the fact that the LEP students have been flat-lined for the past three years in math and language arts. You have the slide there. That was one thing that we looked at. We looked at it at a micro level. What you have in front of you is an actual report card. The school, the name of the teacher, the name of the student has been removed for obvious reasons.

But this is a student that is less than 2.0% proficient in English who is in one of our schools in the eighth grade. He is here less than a year and is not receiving any instruction in their native language. Everything is in English. The only thing that she can really brag about is music. I attribute it to the fact that we Latinos are really good dancers. If it wasn't the case, I wonder where she would be. So because of these two, while I feel really strong evidence that something has to be done, in addition to the program review we need to change the program. You may be asking, why are we doing middle grades? There are two reasons. That's where the primary need lies right now. I just showed you evidence of that. For the most part, k-5 is still inconsistent but there is more consistency, if you follow what I'm saying. So we need to eliminate, for instance, combination classes. We have schools with four or five combinations. We have schools with six, seven, and eight combinations. I'm all about accountability and holding my teachers accountable for what they do. But in order for me to hold them accountable I have to give them a realistic scenario. I don't know of anybody who can really create the miracle of teaching 25 students at different linguistic levels and three grade spans. Because of that we want to make the system in a way that the students will receive the instruction that they need in the language that they can comprehend. That's the second bullet, which is to increase native language instruction opportunities for those EL students with a CPL of less than 3.4%. That is based on the WIDA continuum of English language development. If you wish, I can send you information about that. Level 3 is what they call developing. At 3.4% and below you haven't really acquired the English academic language necessary for you to survive and succeed in an English-only setting. We also want to optimize the staff and the resources. Definitely we want to increase the NJASK and next year possibly the PARCC scores. Again, we want to secure the continuity of program so a student will receive the same instruction no matter where they are located. The next slide in your handout talks about the design and description. We need to create an equitable quality education for all students for whom English is a second language. We're going to begin this hopefully in the fall of this year. We're going to focus primarily on content development rather than English language development. Students will learn English. That's part of the program. That's included in the curriculum. It's included in their schedules. When I show you in a couple of minutes you'll see how we have increased actually the amount of ESL they're exposed to on a daily basis. Instruction will be conducted by certified bilingual teachers. We're working on procuring the right staff. The instruction modality will be basically determined by the students' proficiency, not if the building has the facility or staff. We're really focusing in the students' needs. All instruction will be anchored on the model curriculum from the NJDOE and the Common Core State Standards. I ask your forgiveness for my childish rendition of Paterson. This is the actual Passaic River. This is by School 18. This is what we have right now. We have pockets. The instruction that is taking place for the middle graders at School 12 is not the same as School 18 and is not the same as School 10. School 26 has no native language instruction k-8, only ESL. We had a parent actually two years ago come and demand that his two daughters receive bilingual education. I was able to talk to another school that has these services and we provided transportation and the girls have been attending bilingual education at another location. Again, we have combined grades. We have sporadic and inconsistent instruction. One modality that is rampant in the district is pullout versus push-in where the teacher, especially the ESL teacher, pulls out the students into a little room . sometimes it's almost like a closet . and they instruct whatever they think the students will be learning. We're going to change that because part of what we're doing with all this is realigning the ESL curriculum to mirror the English language arts curriculum based on the scaffold techniques that the NJDOE has provided us through the model curriculum. This is what we're proposing and this is only an illustration. We're going to take those middle graders, Spanish-speakers, who are 3.4 or less, and we're going to provide transportation for them to attend a self-contained

bilingual instruction. We have partnered with Mr. Thompson from School 21, which will be one of our sites, and we're in the process of finalizing the details. He welcomed the idea tremendously for his own reason, but he's also willing to take those kids from the other sites. The big question that has been coming through our steering committee is if I have a child who's in the seventh grade and I'm taking him home and you're transporting him. So one of the issues we're working with the transportation is that they would be picked up at their neighborhood school and dropped off before 3:10 so they can provide that assistance to the parents. We are going to departmentalize instruction in their native language so that we have a certified highly-qualified math bilingual teacher and language arts. The ESL support, as I mentioned before, will be in the push-in model rather than the pullout model. Newcomers will remain the same. That's already a magnet program for what is called SIFE, School with Interrupted Formal Education. These are kids who come to the United States within the year who have a proficiency of 1 and who have an academic deficit of at least one full grade level. They are sent to School 11 where we have a full Newcomers program and this is the instructional modality that is taking place and that we're proposing also for next year. So as you can see, ESL is 100 minutes a day. It's not that we're not addressing the English development needs. But again, the emphasis is on academic growth. This is what I presented to you, which is how the modality instruction will be determined by the different proficiency levels. Developing is right in the middle so 3.0 to 3.4 will fall probably more towards the entering and beginning structure and 3.5 will fall probably more into the expanding bridging structure. We are addressing all the contents. We are increasing ESL from a 41-minute period to a full 60-minute period a day. Are there any questions?

Comm. Mendez: Let me start with School 11 with the new program. It's my understanding that School 11 is an elementary school. How are we addressing the high school students? One of my biggest concerns with ESL is that if you look at the demographics and the student population it's around 65% Latino and non-English speaking. Every single day we have students from different countries coming into the city. How are we addressing those students at the high school level?

Mr. Suarez: Actually, in reality we have been addressing that question for years now. We have a program called ASIS that is housed at the high school that is a Newcomers program precisely for kids who are 15 years of age or older who are already in the high school age but who have not received formal education and who possess no English development. The program has been very successful to the point that a graduate from that program was the valedictorian from Eastside about two or three years ago. So we are addressing that. We definitely want to expand the Newcomers program at least to the second grade. Beyond that, the literature tells you that it's not really necessary because how behind can you be in first grade that you won't be able to catch up? But we want to expand it from second through twelfth grade. I would love to at some point in time replicate the ASIS program, which is housed now at Eastside, maybe at Kennedy. Right now I have kids from the other side of town just struggling to make it there. Sometimes we provide bus tickets. But if we house the same program and we need to staff it a little better, four years ago we had two teachers there, an ESL and bilingual teacher. The bilingual teacher was RIFA and was never replaced. If we can staff it and support it with the right materials I think we have a winner. Ms. Peron pointed out that we are now talking about the high school. We're in the planning phase. I have more self-contained bilingual at the high school and native language instruction precisely for those subject areas that the people think is easy like math, science, and social studies. We're addressing that. We tried to pay for one of our Spanish teachers to become certified AP in Spanish. We procured the money, we did all the action, and then he quit on us.

Ms. Peron: But we want to continue that because we want to give these students the opportunity to experience something at that level as well. If that's what they're coming in with, that's their strength and their foundation of that native language, then they should have the opportunity to attend a class at that level so that they can experience what accelerated learning is and what an honors class is and not feel so much like they're starting and this is a new program for me. They do have special needs but they do have strengths and we want to tap into that as well.

Comm. Mendez: I would love to see more information about the self-contained class and transporting the students from one side of the city to another side. I don't have too much faith on that. What I would like to see as an effective bilingual program is to have a section of bilingual class in different schools such as School 18, School 24. That's what I would like to see and I've been looking for that. I have three children in Paterson Public Schools. My oldest son was out of district. He was receiving bilingual classes and it was very effective. My two and five-year-olds speak Spanish because we teach them that at home, not because we're teaching them in the school. I will tell you if you go outside the country you're going to see other students from Dominican Republic and Cuba learning two and three languages. It's amazing what they're doing right now. Students come to the US and already know English and they know two other languages on top of that. I wish you luck with this.

Comm. Teague: I have two questions. One of them I was going to piggyback off Comm. Mendez about the busing situation. Are you sure they have that under control as far as transporting the students?

Mr. Suarez: We do and we have experience. We do it right now for Newcomers. The Newcomers program is district-wide. They go to their home schooling and then they get bused to Newcomers.

Dr. Evans: And there have been no issues.

Ms. Peron: There were issues at the beginning. There are always issues. I can't stand here and say that there were no issues. We built in routes so it's not door-to-door. Parents were well aware of it. The locations were set so it was very clear with the time of pickup and drop-off. Mainly the parents were concerned if their kids were going to get home at 5:00 in the evening. In the wintertime it's dark. So we worked out through the kinks. There was tweaking that we had to do. But this year we have been more successful than we were the first year and I think that with what we've learned and how we've set up the routes, I think that's how we want to mirror what we want to do for the magnet schools.

Comm. Teague: I'm asking that question because there have been some incidents, one with my daughter. My wife would be at home and my daughter would be at the door. The bus pulled off and just left her outside. I want to make sure those types of incidents aren't occurring with this program here.

Ms. Peron: As I said, this program is not a door-to-door service. It is a route. So they know the location where the pick-up and the drop-off is. So parents know and they're well aware that they should be at the bus stop to pick up their child. It is a bus stop, but it is in the neighborhood school.

Mr. Suarez: Just as we're doing with Newcomers, parents are notified and we make sure that they know to drop the child at this corner where the school is and that's where

they're going to be dropped off at the end of the day. Like I said before, the issue is that we want to make sure that we don't block or interfere. We understand people have necessities so we cannot for the sake of just creating a program rearrange people's

Comm. Teague: My next question is about the classrooms and this has been an issue for a while with the overcrowding and the different elements in the classroom. Suppose you have a classroom and you have a special needs student there whose parent never brought the child forward to identify them or say that they had issues or things. I know it's kind of difficult to call up a parent and say, "Hey, we think your child has" + We're not going to do that. So how would you go about identifying?

Mr. Suarez: We're going to follow the same protocol that is followed with every student. If the teacher feels that the student is not getting it, then there's a system in place called INRS in addition to the strategies that are designed for ELs with additional pedagogical strategies so that the child can eventually improve.

Ms. Peron: It begins with a survey. It's a process.

Comm. Irving: I have a few questions. Number one, this proposal is slated to be implemented when?

Mr. Suarez: September 2014.

Comm. Irving: With that said, I'm giving the experience that we had with the Martin Luther King and School 20 program of this year. These are major moves we're talking about. We're talking about saying we're going to have two language learner schools, a full school at School 11 and School 21 will be partial.

Mr. Suarez: Geographically speaking right now we have two schools that are already magnets - Don Bosco, who receives kids from School 27, and School 5. They provide services in native language for Bengali and Spanish students. We also have New Roberto Clemente who takes kids from EWK and Roberto Clemente. If the kids need self-contained bilingual services they have it. So we have already in place this structure. In addition, because of what I showed you, we need at least two more, possibly three. We're looking at approximately 250 or 260 students district-wide outside the ones that will go to New Roberto Clemente and Don Bosco that need this type of setting.

Comm. Irving: So where would they go?

Mr. Suarez: School 8 will be one site and School 21 will be the other site. After we're refining the numbers possibly School 24 may be the other site. One big advantage we have this year over previous years is the access scores. I spoke with the director of assessment this morning and the access scores are getting to us before July by the end of June. That will give me a very clear picture of where every child falls.

Comm. Irving: From a staffing standpoint, what staffing needs need to be met? I assume they will become a small population and a much larger population in the school. Needless to say, I think what we've learned at Martin Luther King and School 20 is that when we do that move there still needs to be. You may have a principal that may not have a background in working with ELL populations. I'm looking at School 21 and School 24 and just knowing the principals from being a community person I'm just guessing that they don't have that experience. So what support are we going to give

the principals, vis-à-vis what we've learned at Martin Luther King and School 20, in order to support these students and the faculty that will be teaching these courses?

Mr. Suarez: There are two parts to your question. I'm going to answer the second part first. I want to say that just because you're not an expert in bilingual doesn't mean necessarily that you don't get it. We have principals who are experts and have the training, but they don't get it. We have principals with no formal training who get it. At School 21, we have extensive conversations with Mr. Thompson and I can tell you that he gets it. In terms of support, we are providing resources. Today we were able to secure about 60 pieces of furniture. So whatever support they need my department will be at their full disposal.

Comm. Irving: I guess what I'd like to know specifically is where are those resources and what does that support look like. I appreciate in Mr. Thompson's case that you say he gets it. But that still needs to be reinforced by your department making sure that we cross our T's and dot our I's to ensure that this new infusion of the program does not interrupt the day-to-day flow for how the principal still needs to run the entire school building. This is another undertaking that we're asking the principal to take and I want to make sure that principal has the support that they need.

Ms. Peron: The plan that we outlined today was the logistics. What you're asking for is what other supports and resources are in place to follow through on this plan to help the administrators and the teachers understand the type of program design that we're presenting. So we have school-based supervisors who are from the bilingual department that work through the office of the operational assistant superintendents who are involved in teaching and learning of those classrooms. We have them district-wide, but specifically we have them to work with the teachers at those schools. We also have a professional development plan that we have designed and we began last year with IFL working solely on the equity and accessibility to Common Core for ELs and teachers of ELs so that they learn the new scaffolding strategies, the pedagogy behind bilingual education. So we began with six schools last year and this year we are going into the next school year. We're expanding that to include these teachers here and that training has already begun. It will be followed through with Bridges to Practice. They go to the workshops and they have coaching in class and walk-throughs as well. We also need to hire staff.

Comm. Irving: That was my question.

Ms. Peron: That was the first part of your question. I wrote that down. We do need additional staff. That was included in the budget. That was included in the plan. So we have been conducting job fairs. We have explored other areas in going out and reaching out to different universities that have the bilingual education component, the endorsement, and the certificate so that we can recruit candidates. The next step is that we have two options. Option A is that we have this whole plan designed. We have it vetted. We've talked to administrators. We've talked to facilities. We've walked through the schools. We have the administrators set up the schedules with the fact of knowing that we're going to have a self-contained sixth through eighth grade. If we do not recruit candidates, if we do not have the staff, I will not move forward with this plan.

Comm. Irving: Exactly how many staff do we need to implement this?

Mr. Suarez: Actually, we're looking at about 16 teachers actually. Six will be bilingual. I failed to mention in my presentation that students who have reached 3.5 will be put in a general education with ESL support. So we're going to need six bilingual and about 10

ESL teachers. Those schools that are sending us our 3.4 the 3.5 are now left in limbo. Our experience tells us ESL is a lot easier to hire than good bilingual teachers. I concur with Ms. Peron for the obvious reasons that if we cannot procure those six bilingual certified good teachers who have proficiency in both languages it's futile to go forward with the plan.

Comm. Irving: Here's what I would appreciate, Dr. Evans. At the August meeting, I'd like to hear a report for where we are. Since this is supposed to be implemented at such a rapid pace, I think it would be important for the Board to understand where we are with regards to implementation, hiring, scheduling, training of principals, and necessary staff associated with it.

Dr. Evans: Sure. There's one other element to this. This summer, as usual, I will be providing professional development to our principals. This summer's focus will be on school culture and managing special programs, whether it's special education, English language learners, or whatever special program. Particularly the skill sets associated with managing special programs is an area of great need across the district. In one of my past lives that was my job, to train principals and special education directors on how to manage special programs either within a building or in unique settings. So that's a need that we've identified for our principals.

Comm. Hodges: What does CPL stand for?

Mr. Suarez: Composite proficiency level. That is from WIDA, World-Class Instructional Design and Assessment. It's a consortium of 28 states. New Jersey is one of the member states. They are the people who created and monitor the access test that is mandated by the state. In addition to just the testing, they also provide standards for instruction. They develop those six levels of the continuum of language development. Normally when the student takes the access test it measures in academic language all four linguistic domains . reading, writing, speaking, and listening. Out of those scores they have a raw score and from there it gets translated through a formula into a level. Then it get averaged out and that's you're composite level.

Comm. Hodges: I'm looking at this report card and I'm a little alarmed because while we have services for Spanish and Bengali and Arabic, there are still a number of other students who come here with other languages. What do we do for them? If they're experiencing this kind of performance I'm really staggered by the challenges those kids are facing and we don't have the large enough cohorts to develop this kind of program for them. So what kind of support do they receive?

Ms. Peron: The support they receive is the only one we can give them . English as a second language. We give them intensive ESL services. But to provide native language instruction we would have to find an educator, a certified teacher, of that language. So it is a huge challenge for us. One of our growing languages in the city, which is Bengali, has been a challenge for us too. To recruit certified effective teachers of that language has been a challenge. It's a reality not only for us but in New Jersey and other states.

Comm. Hodges: The problem I'm having is I need a greater sense of what those numbers are because they impact our test scores. So somehow or other we're going to have to fashion some sort of concrete plan to address that because it seems to me that depending on how large our number of these students if they're coming out with scores like this they're being cheated and correspondingly the district is paying a price for that. So I personally would like to have a greater sense of how large a cohort of students,

what kind of languages, and then some sort of sense of what's being done for these children. This child had four F's in science, which is a particular affront to me. I really would like to see what we are doing and craft some plans to address that. There are other ways to bring people in who can provide assistance. I know the hospital does it. We have to do something because we just can't leave these kids to fly. You can get discouraged quickly if you're bringing home test scores like this and decide you don't want to continue. Or you're getting further behind and your classmates are moving ahead of you and you're lost. Enough said there.

Mr. Suarez: Let me just say even with the Bengali population one of the challenges we're having is finding material in native language. So I reached out to the Bengali community to hire respected members. They did a search for us and they found nothing that they could really provide us. We have 36 languages in the district. So we understand exactly what you're saying, Dr. Hodges. It's really a big challenge. We're having a challenge finding Spanish certified bilingual teachers. So imagine now somebody with Vietnamese, Urdu, or another language.

Comm. Hodges: There are other large cities that are facing similar challenges. I'm kind of curious as to what they're doing to address this situation. There are some places, like you said, down in Texas and New Mexico. Those services aren't immediately available so they have to craft a solution for this problem. I'm curious.

Dr. Evans: There are some things we can do, Dr. Hodges. You're right. I know what one large district does and it's very costly. Because there are a large number of colleges and universities typically you can find a professor who is proficient at many of the languages that are represented in a particular school district. You can contract with them to do one of two things. If you have a critical mass of students you can contract with them to come and teach the youngsters in their native language. It's kind of like a dual language environment. They start out teaching in a native language and transition over time, like we do bilingual, into English. Yet another is taking advantage of technology. We can find somewhere in these United States somebody who speaks every language represented here and if they are either certified as a teacher or a professor at a university use telecommunications, and that may be the challenge. We need to make sure our telecommunications can handle it. But pipe them in, so to speak, and do it via telecommunications. There are other options like that. Those are the kinds of options we need to begin looking at. Yet another one that we don't do enough of for me is to go after the teachers. If it's Spanish we need to send teachers to Florida because there are schools all over Florida teaching people and certifying them as teachers. Actually, if you teach in Florida you have to have an endorsement in ESOL anyway. That's a requirement by the state because the population has grown to that extent. That may be something we want to think about too. Right away you get more teachers who are eligible and certified. But we need to recruit way beyond the boundaries of New Jersey. We really do for that very reason.

Comm. Hodges: I can imagine a child trying their best but being confronted with scores like this and then saying is this really worth it.

Mr. Suarez: I truly appreciate your concern because it's a concern of ours.

Comm. Hodges: I'll ask again in July. You know that.

Mr. Suarez: At least give me until August.

Comm. Cleaves: Are there any more questions?

Full Service Community Schools

Ms. Tobi Knehr: Good evening. I want to thank you very much for your indulgence. I was away for a couple of weeks and I think there was a miscommunication so I thought we were here and I really appreciate your patience in allowing us to be here after all. I did pass out the formal report, but I have the PowerPoint right here. This is a midway report that looks at our first three years out of a five-year plan. In putting this together, our experts in evaluation have been acknowledged so I'd like to invite our team up to do the presentation. Let me introduce to you Dr. Helene Clark.

Dr. Helene Clark: Thank you very much for allowing us to present the results here. This has been a while in coming. We began the evaluation of the Paterson Full Service Community Schools in 2010. It actually started before the federal grant kicked in in September with a theory of change meeting for School 5, the first Full Service Community School. That sounds like jargon, but it isn't. I'll explain in a minute how it's the basis for the program design and the evaluation plan. The evaluation has been up and running all that time and it continues now in all five schools. In year 1 there was just School 5. In year 2 Napier and New Roberto Clemente came on. In this last year two more schools came on board. This evaluation represents the midpoint of the five-year federal grant and it includes the first three schools, School 5, Napier, and New Roberto Clemente. It doesn't include the two schools that have come on in 2013. Just to say briefly how we approached this, it's longitudinal, meaning we're looking at change over time. We're looking to see if students and schools that were low-performing at baseline in 2010 are improving year by year because nothing happens overnight. You don't expect to see low performing students after one semester of after school being at the top of the test scores. This is over years. It's participatory in that we have been actively involving site directors, community partners, PPS, parent coordinators, students, and principals in understanding what's being implemented at the school. It's quantitative in that we've been collecting hard numbers. What are test scores? What is attendance? It's qualitative in that we've been looking to be interpretive. What goes on in the context of each school? Each school does have different situations, be it geography, demographics, school change, and so on. So we looked at it from both the numerical and the interpretive point of view. Just a few of the data sources that we've looked at, one of course is NJASK, tracking achievement scores over time. Another is youth surveys in each school. We do surveys with youth at the beginning and the end of the school year. What we're looking for are changes in youth development attributes. We're looking to see whether students after they've experienced a community school for those years do they feel more engaged and more welcome in school. Do they see more hope for their future? There are many youth development measures. The full report goes into detail on that. I won't go into detail. We visit the school with observation and site visits. The two lead evaluators are here and will assist me in answering any questions that you might have because they are on the ground in the schools on a regular basis over the last three years. We do key stakeholder interviews and in terms of feedback and peer learning every summer we've been doing the professional development work which Tobi Knehr has pulled together and has included all of the schools learning from each other and from the evaluation, as well as more informal monthly meetings that we do with all of the sites. The framework for the evaluation is something called Theory of Change. It's very simply a way of saying what a Community School model is. It's grounded and very contextual. In this school and city, what would it take in order to reach the goals that Paterson has for its students? What would it take in this school given the barriers and challenges of this particular school to get where we want to go? If the Theory of Change is what do all the stakeholders who come together, the partners, principals, teachers, and PPS, what will it take in order to get from where you are today to high achieving students? Clearly

there's a long road to travel for schools that are under-resourced and with kids that have not been doing well on their grades and test scores. So, the whole approach is based on having a very sound model and then we evaluate whether that model is in fact working or not. One of the reasons that we like this approach other than it makes very clear what the expectations are is that outcomes are measured at the appropriate time. In other words, we're not looking in year 1 to see whether all of the kids in Paterson are graduating high school. In year 1 we're looking to see whether School 5, Napier, and New Roberto Clemente made the changes within their schools climate, partnerships, and engagement with parents. Did they make the changes that were needed to set the stage for future development? So we're not looking at things that would not happen in year 1. We're looking at those things much later on. Keep in mind that Community Schools are new systems. It's creating a school that really demonstrates collective impact and they require time for all of the partners to get used to working together and seeing how providing health, mental health, in-school suspension, adult education, after-school programs, and a million things I'm leaving out how do those things all work together? How do a principal and a non-profit partner, school district, and parents all create a synergetic system so that all of those components lead to concrete achievement for students? It takes time and what we've been really interested in in years 1-3 is, are the foundations being put in place that will make sure that these schools actually implement the model well enough to produce the achievement results in future years? The first three years are very much looking at the foundations. However, spoiler alert, we actually got results beyond what we were looking for, which was very exciting when we did the analysis. The way that this works is to give you a sense of what we're looking at. The stakeholders initially in July 2010 came together to create the plan for School 5 and all of those stakeholders asked, what's the ultimate outcome? They decided the ultimate outcome was that all Paterson students graduate from high school. That's what went in the ultimate outcome box. But then you see there's an accountability ceiling. What that means is we're not as evaluators going to measure whether all Paterson students graduate from high school. That's at a timeline that's probably at least 10 years away. It's not in the first or second year of this Community School initiative. So the ultimate outcome is to have a Community School to get all Paterson kids to graduate high school. But it's not going to happen immediately. The long-term outcome is what we're really interested in measuring as evaluators. Each school is set to specific long-term outcomes, but that may be around closing an achievement gap. It may be ending chronic absenteeism. It may be reaching all students being at least median in their test scores. So the long-term outcome is something that is measurable, doable, and achievable within the timeframe of the evaluation. The whole idea of a Community School is that the improvements and achievements are only going to happen if lots of other things happen first. It's only going to happen if teachers are really on board in teaching a curriculum, if kids that are particularly at risk are getting the special help they need, and if the kids that are chronically absent are having their family's problems addressed. Why are they chronically absent? That's been a special focus within the Community Schools. So the preconditions are things that need to happen before you can reasonably expect that achievement and high school graduation rates are going to go way up. For example that came out of this evaluation, if the ultimate goal is that all Paterson students graduate high school just two things that you would need for that to happen, there are many, are good grades and good attendance for the average student. In order to get good attendance, and we discovered this through the evaluation, two things were keeping students from attending school enough to do well and one was health issues. Some of those health issues were as simple as not being able to see because they never got prescription eyeglasses. Other health issues may be asthma or chronic illnesses. But health issues keep kids out of school. Trips of the emergency room keep kids out of school. The other thing that keeps kids out of school is parents who don't

realize the importance of their children being in school all the time. We had teachers telling us that there are parents who take their children home to the Dominican Republic for the month of December for family time. They think they can talk to the teachers and their students will catch up. It doesn't happen. You don't catch up when you miss 30 or 60 days of school. Two of the things that are necessary to address before we even look for good grades is that students' health issues are being addressed and that the parents really realize that their kids can't miss 30 or 60 days of school. In order for parents to understand their kids have to be in school the parents themselves have to be able to provide the support and that's where a lot of the adult education programs come in in providing family stability that allows the parents to send their kids to school. In the health area, one thing that we found was that the addition of health services by the second year of the initiative made a very big difference in students actually showing up for school. We know from literature, from practices around the country, and from common sense that showing up for school is a prerequisite to doing well and graduating. That's just a little example of how we look at what's needed each step of the way. This is where we had some good findings so we pulled this out as the example. Some of the things that we're looking at before we expect to see good grades, is the school climate encouraging to students to come to school? Do they feel welcomed, respected, and engaged in learning? Are students healthy? Have they had breakfast? Can they concentrate? Are parents engaged in knowing that their kids need to come to school and do their homework? Are the families themselves stable? Are particularly at-risk kids getting the help they need in after-school so that they don't fall farther behind? That's just a sample of the preconditions we're looking at before we expect to see the Community Schools produce the academic achievement we're looking for at the end of the day. We had some surprisingly good news under the circumstances. Let me back up and say that Napier and New Roberto Clemente underwent some fair amount of disruption in the period that we were evaluating. So we didn't actually hypothesize that there would be great improvements in schools. Napier was, as you all know, dispersed because of Hurricane Irene. New Roberto Clemente has undergone school change. Nonetheless, in spite of the disruption to two of the schools, all three of the schools that we evaluated did improve academically and more startlingly they outperformed the peer schools in student growth on the NJASK. Students both in after-school programs and those getting health services have statistically significantly better attendance at school. So if you get a targeted service after school or health it makes a significant difference in actually showing up for school. Students in the after-school program did better academically than those not in the after school. That should happen. It should be that you're not wasting your money on that. You would expect that kids in the after-school would do better, but there are various reasons that it may not occur. But what we found that's significant is that kids who were targeted for specific programs in after-school, such as literacy programs, English language programs, they did better. So, targeting kids in after-school really makes a difference in their ability to improve their scores. These are just some of the details of the results. In student proficiency, School 5, which is the most mature of the Community Schools having started in year 1, saw an increase in student proficiency in both language arts and math between 2012 and 2013. It became a Community School in September 2010. You can see it takes a couple of years to get established. But by the 2012-13 school year student proficiency increased on both language arts and math. All three schools saw significant increase in student growth in comparison to peer schools and statewide. We're talking about the most mature school so we got the best results at School 5. It had the least disruption over the three-year period and it's been a Community School the longest. Students with limited English proficiency showed somewhat higher improvements on the language arts. Not dramatically higher, but we're starting to see a trend towards better scores for our limited English students. At School 5 students participating in the after-school program improved more on both

language arts and math scores than students who didn't. Particularly dealing with at-risk students who are the most likely to be in targeted after-school programs we have an example at Napier. In spite of Napier being dispersed to four different locations and all of the disruption the most at-risk students that were targeted for a specific after-school program, kids who were in Be Great Graduate showed improvements in language arts and math over 2012-13. After school students had better attendance. Again, at School 5 students attending after-school attended school 20 more days on average than kids not in after-school. That's a phenomenal increase in attendance. For Napier and New Roberto Clemente which came on later they increased by 12 days and 17 days. Those are also fairly significant numbers. This is the last page of results here. Health services led to better attendance. In School 5 and New Roberto Clemente those students who received any health service, whether it was eyeglasses or whatever it was, attended school 14 days and 12 days more than students who didn't receive a health service. Suspension rates declined. School 5 had the lowest suspension rate and Napier saw the greatest decline in suspension rates. Some of this has to do with having an in-school suspension program, so that changes the numbers. Finally, after-school students showed positive youth development. The positive youth development are things that we look for to see that youth are changing in their attitudes and behaviors that will make them more likely to be engaged in school, want to go to college, and feel that it's possible for them to go to college. So the student surveys as well as the interviews with principals and site directors show that the students that were participating in enrichment activities said their learning skills to be successful scored well on all aspects of positive youth development and they believed that they can succeed in school. That's a big change from baseline. These were pretty astonishing for us given that the schools Napier and New Roberto Clemente only came on not for three years of evaluation but only for two and that in their first and second years they had lots going on. These are pretty dramatic short-term results. In summary, in spite of severe disruptions, the Community Schools created a sense of community and a stability that allowed schools experiencing disruption and disorganization to not only maintain but improve student achievement. A caveat is that resources equal results. The kids that did better are the kids who got after-school services and health services. Not every kid is in after-school or health services. After-school programs aren't funded to provide for every student in the school. To the extent that the model works it works when the components are in place. The more the components are in place, the more rise we see in the students. Preconditions to success such as nutrition, health, solving behavioral problems, engaging parents, and improving the stability of parents and targeted academic health, these are necessary to long-term benefits. The long-term benefits don't happen unless you have a plan in place for these conditions to change and this is where we did see change occurring. Not to the extent that would make the entire school serve every student equally, but at a significant level of improvement so that where it was funded it worked. I'm not going to go into recommendations because you've been here a long time already tonight. They are in the full report along with tables that show the exact increases on different measures. But our overall recommendation is that a Community School is a perfect model of collective impact where community partners, the school district, the principal, the teachers, the parents, and the students all have a role to play and it's doing all of those pieces together that lead ultimately to academic achievement, and they face tremendous challenges in doing so. It's not a trajectory of just onward and upward. We have money, let's make a Community School, and everybody is going to go to college. It's two steps forward one step back. There are floods. There are new principals coming on board. There are all kinds of things that happen. So it's an evolving organic system, but with the components all in place it's a great model of collective impact and we're just delighted after working on the evaluation for four years now and the three years that we did see really positive indications and findings. I'll stop there and refer you to the full report. For

anyone who's interested and likes to look at charts it's the full model that was developed initially. It's the centerfold and everything of what it takes to make a Community School work. It's about time to update this. We're going to be doing that in the summer of 2014, updating that model to account for the lessons learned so far.

Comm. Kerr: I must say that I'm a proponent of Community Schools. I truly believe in Community Schools. I believe that they can change the entire culture of the building. I was personally exposed to Community Schools through the Paterson Education Fund. We took a trip to New York, the Bronx, and we looked at that model. From where I sit, we all desire growth and positive outcomes in every school. So the problem I face is what strategy do we employ to get those results? What I did not hear tonight is how do we go about engaging parents in the process? That's a very vital piece as you have mentioned there. Do we provide the health services in the building? Does the parent have an office in the building where they can help organizing work around the building? How does your model function?

Dr. Clark: Well, we've evaluated different Community School models around the country and they all deal with those questions a little bit differently. I'll take the easy part of the question first, which is health services in the school or not in the school. In New York City they have both, community centers where students can go for health services and in-school health clinics. We found, and it's definitely true in Paterson, that having the health services onsite is what makes the huge difference. It keeps kids from being pulled out of class. It keeps parents from having to leave work to come and take their child out. Health services onsite is a component that really makes a difference. The harder part of your question is parent engagement. What I wanted to speak to a little more specifically is we know that some of the schools and more than others have made strides with parent engagement, but it is a huge issue. Which school has the parent coordinator? Is it School 5? I'm going to let Tobi answer it because I don't know it in the detail that they know it. In the schools that have a parent coordinator and the parent coordinator is from the language group that the new coming students are from it has been most effective and the adult education that has helped parents with literacy so that the families are more stable do seem to be effective. But I'm saying that anecdotally. We haven't studied that systematically. In the final year of the five years we're going to really try to tie changes in parent stability to student outcomes which we haven't done yet. I'm going to let Tobi talk about what specifically happened for parent engagement. I think it's one of the most difficult areas to get really functioning completely and how thorough it has to be for the model to work is an open question.

Ms. Knehr: Good evening again. When we look at parent engagement first we know that there are strengths in certain schools and weaknesses at others. We've worked very diligently with the Family and Community Engagement Department as well as the Adult School so that we can meet the two most important needs that parents have specified themselves. One of those is education. So we have been working diligently with the Adult School to provide ESL and with the idea to grow that into GED courses and citizenship courses. Being that School 5 is our most mature school we've seen the most outcomes there. In fact, last year there were six parents who successfully became citizens because of their work through the ESL program at School 5. This year we have students that are getting ready to be able to be eligible for GED classes because now they have the skills that they need for those courses. So it goes back to the beginning looking at the steps you need to provide to even move for success. So you're really laying a very intense groundwork so that you have stability that then develops and grows into success. We tried very hard, but it's not as successful to do this without a fulltime community engagement person in the building. Looking at School 5 we have a very tight team. We call it the School 5 team. Their parent community engagement

coordinator is an equal member of the Leadership Team. So when Mr. Chowdury puts a program together it is symbiotic with what Principal Diodonet and what the Site Coordinator Ms. Lebron is doing and it's completely in cohesive manner. Where we have a part-time person it is much more difficult to get that rate of success.

Comm. Kerr: We know that that is a successful model with School 5. Now, if we look at that model, it is something we can transplant? Or do we have to tailor something for every school we go into?

Ms. Knehr: A big portion of that is looking at the native language of that parent coordinator. Is that person fine-tuned to the population of that school? So having a fulltime Bengali-speaking person, I think everyone would say that's a key to success there. But again, we want it fulltime and that means resources, money. So not having a fulltime Spanish-speaking person at NRC or School 15 is going to be a detriment.

Comm. Kerr: The problem is from what was said there, the fact that they have a Community School it generated positive outcomes. If it generates positive outcomes we should not be concerned so much about a few dollars because we spend those dollars in areas that are not as productive. So we have to kind of somewhat weigh what works and what doesn't work. That's where I'm looking at.

Ms. Knehr: I do want to point out this is being developed for this coming year's evaluation, being able to match what a parent is involved with to the student that is in the school. That's been a very challenging action because of different mobility and who do we count as family members. Life happens and in the best of circumstances life is not always a nice trajectory. So we're trying. I think we've got it down where we can take each student and if their aunt who lives with them fulltime is in an ESL class who provides parenting now we know that she's in a class and how does that impact that student's success in school. I think that next year we're going to have some really amazing stuff.

Comm. Kerr: In our approach to parents, do we sell the idea that as a Community School the school belongs to you and your kids so they feel a part of what is happening inside that building and take ownership for what is happening inside that building?

Ms. Knehr: I'm very partial. I say yes. We do sell it. We see great impact in that.

Comm. Kerr: Can that be measured?

Ms. Knehr: Yes.

Dr. Clark: As the evaluator I may be a little more objective than Tobi on that. One of the things that we see as a precondition to parent engagement is that parents feel welcome in the school, that they don't get messages from teachers or principals or administrators that they're not welcome, that they have a place to go in the school, and that there are multiple ways for them to engage. So just holding a parent/teacher night may not work for some parents who work at night or don't want to go to the school after dark. Very many different modalities to allow parents to engage are all a precondition. All of these things have to be in place. To your question, can it be transported? If it works in one school will it work in another school? It does have to be adapted specifically for the needs of that school. What keeps parents away? Is it a lack of respect? Is it fear of a school building? Is it that they're working three jobs? So you do have to adapt it, but there are elements of making a parent feel welcome, having a place to go, seeing a reason to be there, and having different ways to engage that

you're comfortable with. Those transfer across all schools. So if you have all the preconditions in place then you have to be contextual. What works in this school? A really good question you asked and we don't have an answer in the evaluation to it yet is how important is parent engagement at a very broad level. We know that having parents who are literate and want their kids to go to college matters. The home environment is in the literature. We know that's true. How active do all parents of students need to be for students to be able to achieve? We don't know. It may be that there are lots of students who can do well through the school supports even if not every parent is reached. That needs to be tested. When you talk about where to put resources, is it worth putting resources? It's a lot of resources to reach each and every single parent in a meaningful way. Is that necessary? Or is reaching key parents of at risk students who are chronically absent or failing the place to put the resources? We don't have an evidentiary answer to that, but that's the right question.

Comm. Mendez: Tobí, how are you? You're doing a great job. Congratulations. Now that we're going to have School 15 as a new Full Service Community School, what is the relationship that we're going to have between NRC and School 15? Are we going to have any program that combines between the two schools taking into consideration that they are in the same neighborhood?

Ms. Knehr: I think you might be referencing our ambitious bid for the next round of the Full Service Community School federal grant. Because this grant is only eligible for new programs . new meaning not funded previously from the federal government . we won't be able to use that grant for a new grant for this current three federally funded schools. This means now we haven't been able to use those federal funds for School 15 and School 6. So if we were to get this grant for School 15 and School 6 it would be able to help us financially take them to the level that our original three schools are at and offset those costs. Specifically with School 15 and NRC just continuing to build that relationship so that it is that continuum from pre-k through 8th grade. I'd love it if in another five years after this we could talk about high school, but just that continuum that we started you out in pre-k and we took you through eighth grade. I have a really unique opportunity to do that in a special way at School 15 and NRC given that they are feeder schools and you can see that development in the child and in the family.

Comm. Mendez: Because of the location I think that the district should take that into consideration. Because of the facility we have at NRC we can take advantage of that. It's something we don't have at School 15.

Ms. Knehr: We're going to be partnering with them. In School 6 all of that will naturally and organically happen in one building. But because they are separate we would be able to extend some of those resources over to NRC.

Comm. Martinez: The effectiveness of Community Schools, at least in my opinion, can be summarized simply by saying that the Community Schools approach is a holistic approach and you're treating the whole needs of the child as well as the families. The intent is quite simply to remove the boundaries to the extent to which we can that these families are facing externally so once our students do come to school the notion is quite simple. If we can make the families live all that much better they can be better parents and guardians to those students. When those students come to school they're better learners. All of these things are interconnected. You can't separate the challenges and the struggles they're facing outside the school and expect them to come to the door, check that baggage, and just show up ready to go. So if a child's basic needs are not being met it's going to affect them. I speak to this because I'm passionate about it. It's the work that I do and I'm a full proponent of it. To the extent to which we can we

remove those boundaries to make their lives easier so they can make their students' lives easier so we can teach them all the more effectively.

Comm. Teague: Am I allowed to mention a staff member's name if it's to congratulate them? Or should I just talk about the school in general?

Comm. Cleaves: No.

Comm. Teague: Okay. I just want to mention at School 5 in February they were able to register about 250 families for Obamacare. That's just one example of how those students actually came together and actually fulfilled a goal. They wanted to do less than that, but they ended up going over there. That's just one of the many things that they do. Then they have a community garden, if I'm not mistaken. They were working with several organizations. If I had it my way all the schools would be this way because when you see how they work together it's just a beautiful thing. I want to commend you and your staff for the work that you're doing.

Comm. Cleaves: Thank you.

Ms. Knehr: Thank you very much for your time.

REPORT OF STATE DISTRICT SUPERINTENDENT

Dr. Evans: I have two additional items. First of all, today the valedictorians and salutatorians for each of our high schools were recognized in a function that was sponsored by the County Superintendent. Ms. Shafer attended on my behalf. As you all know, I was in Trenton in the State Board meeting and so she attended. One of the things obviously that we need to do more of is to recognize students such as those that were involved in this activity today. I plan to say more and to more formally recognize them in the televised Board meeting coming up in a couple of weeks, but I did want to mention it since the activity did occur today. Secondly, I'm inclined to comment further and to continue to express my gratitude that those who have contributed to today's activity around local control have given. I'm also inclined to speak more as a father in some ways since I'm the oldest person sitting around this table, maybe not the oldest person in this room. I see one or two people who might challenge me in the audience. It won't surprise anybody in this room and in this city that everybody doesn't believe that local control should be returned to Paterson. You need to be aware of that. You need to be very much aware of that because there are people who have questioned it. In fact, in the five years and 26 days that I've been here, people have said, "Why do you support that initiative? Why do you want to go there? They will only return to where they were when local control was imposed. Once they get it everyone lets their hair down and maybe management changes and a number of things happen." I say that for a reason. I say that because it's important that everyone in this room, particularly the Board, makes sure that we don't revert to the things that are in this report that was prepared in 1991. If you haven't read it you need to read it. We don't want this to happen again because just as surely as it happens again the district will be returned to state control completely. I'm saying that so that everyone takes it as seriously as I do. I know the Board does. I've been involved with the Board enough to know that they're taking it very seriously. But I don't want any of us to let our hair down, to relax our effort to maintain the gift. We've only been given one DPR and that's operations. For me it's the icing on one layer of a five-layer cake. So we have four more layers to take care of and we will. I know Commissioner Hespy as was Commissioner Cerf is serious about helping us to that end. Otherwise it wouldn't be happening. But we cannot find ourselves slipping back to past behaviors that were problematic for us. The Board is

doing all the right things and holding us accountable for what we're supposed to be doing if we're not doing it, asking the right questions, demanding these kinds of evaluation reports you heard tonight to ensure that we are not only exercising good judgment and best practice as we implement programs, but we're generating the outcomes that we need to generate. Those are all the right things. But again, we can't get into some of the mismanagement that's represented in this report from back in the late 1980s and early 1990s, the issues associated with fiscal mismanagement as well as program mismanagement. I can go on and on, but I hope you understand what I'm trying to say. If you have children you know sometimes you can hold kids accountable, but the minute you relax that accountability they slip back into past behaviors. You have to watch them and you have to stay with them and supervise them and make sure they're doing the right thing. That's what I'm saying to not just everyone in this room. I'm saying it to the entire community and I'm going to repeat some of what I'm saying in the televised meeting in a couple of weeks. But we cannot afford slippage. We can't afford going backwards. There is strong forward momentum to continue on a shorter timeline than most people realize because Commissioner Hespy is prepared to move quicker than Commissioner Cerf was in giving us back all five DPRs. But the minute it's obvious that this is not going to work, that's going to change. So I ask that everyone continue to work with us to make this happen. I hold my staff accountable. I have very high expectations for my staff and even there sometimes we have slippage and I have to do things I don't necessarily want to do to make adjustments. The Board does the same thing to us as an administration. Those are the right things to do. But please don't contribute to returning to everything that's documented in this 1991 report. I'll stop there. I could say more, but I think you get my point.

Comm. Hodges: I have just a brief comment, Dr. Evans. I certainly appreciate your remarks. However, I don't want the public to just get the idea that if the state hadn't run in here over the last soon to be 23 years we would have been lost in the wilderness. Many of the people who sat on that Board demanded better. In fact, they had to do that despite what the state was doing. Some of us sitting at this table a long time understand that. We had to fight the state to get some of the things that we wanted done here because they didn't want to deliver it or pay attention to the mismanagement that occurred under their watch. So I just want people to understand that they weren't the savior that just came in. The district was given to them. They didn't take it. It was voted into the hands of the state, which was a major mistake. It wasn't just given to them or they didn't just come here and take it and then lead us through the wilderness for 23 years and now we're saved. That's not the picture at all. This Board and previous Boards worked hard and fought hard. And quite frankly, having interfaced with a number of districts throughout this state and from what I'm hearing goes on in these other districts, it is shocking to me that we're still in this situation and many of them are not. I'm just putting that on the table because increasingly I am stunned that districts don't look at student achievement, they don't follow up on facilities, and we have no choice to do these. They're sitting there telling me, "We don't do that," but they get these high QSAC scores and we get 74, which is just low enough to not make it.

Dr. Evans: I don't disagree with anything you're saying, Dr. Hodges. I really don't. I just don't want us to do things that we know are going to be problematic.

Comm. Hodges: I agree.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

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

Ms. Rosie Grant: Good evening. I hate to disappoint. I want to start by saying congratulations on the return of operations to the Paterson Public Schools. This is quite a milestone. I want to read from our press statement, a statement from our Board Chair Jaime Dykes, who's also the head of the Greater Paterson Chamber of Commerce. %As we celebrate this milestone we're cognizant of the history that brought us to takeover in the first place. We need to know and remember our history in order to secure the best possible future for our communities, particularly for our children. PEF has archives of reports, news articles, assessments, audits, and other information pertinent to takeover and this ongoing long process of returning to local control. Let's be careful not to fall back into the bad habits of the past.+ As Dr. Evans said, let's maintain the good habits that this Board and this administration have developed. My statement in the same press release is, %We must continue to show substantial and sustained improvements in the areas of fiscal management, governance, instruction, and personnel so that we can continue this process of returning Paterson to local control.+ I want to thank every Board member, staff member, student, parent, community partner, administrator, funder, and volunteer who participated in any advocacy and any implementation that led to improvement in the Paterson Public School District. I also want to comment on the Full Service Community Schools report. Congratulations on a positive report. Great results in that assessment that we're seeing in the Full Service Community Schools! I want to remind you that PEF led the community process for the implementation of Full Service Community Schools and we continue to support it. We support it through assessment of school needs when schools are identified to become Full Service Community Schools. We provide technical assistance to community partners and we in fact work with other community partners to identify the lead agency that will serve in each of these schools. Mr. Kerr mentioned his visit to New York City. We not only had several visits of several groups of people from Paterson to New York City, but also took people to Philadelphia, Lincoln, Nebraska, and Kansas City, Missouri to look at exemplary community schools around the country. Now we have some of those exemplary schools right here in Paterson. So please give them your full support. Thank you.

Mr. Tony DellaBovie: Good evening. My name is Tony DellaBovie and I'm the Regional Vice President for ABM Janitorial Services in the State of New Jersey. I'm here tonight particularly as it pertains to Item C-19 on the agenda which proposes the award of the janitorial contract to a competitor of ours for an amount of \$9.9 million per year for a two-year contract. This is an amount which is \$700,000 a year more than our proposed amount for the past bid. We ask that the Board review this proposal a bit more closely and we hope that common sense will prevail and that \$1.4 million can be utilized to buy books and pay teachers and not be used for mops and buckets. Thank you for your time.

It was moved by Comm. Mendez, seconded by Comm. Guzman 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 May 27, 2014, beginning with vendor number 149 and ending with vendor number 799452, in the amount of \$5,159,698.05, to be approved for payment; 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. Mendez, seconded by Comm. Cleaves that Resolution No. 1 be adopted. On roll call all members voted as follows:

Comm. Cleaves: Yes, but I abstain from anything having to do with my name.

Comm. Guzman: Yes, but I abstain from anything dealing with the City of Paterson.

Comm. Irving: Dr. Hodges, your reimbursement for the convention is included in that. That's why you have to abstain.

Comm. Hodges: I pass.

Comm. Kerr: Yes.

Comm. Martinez: Yes.

Comm. Mendez: Yes.

Comm. Simmons: Yes.

Comm. Teague: Yes.

Comm. Hodges: I vote no.

Comm. Irving: Yes.

The motion carried.

Resolution No. 2

WHEREAS, on March 15, 2007, the State of New Jersey adopted P.L.2007, c.53, *An Act Concerning School District Accountability*, also known as Assembly Bill 5 (A5), and

WHEREAS, Bill A5, N.J.S.A. 18A:11-12(3)f, requires that conferences/workshops have prior approval by a majority of the full voting membership of the board of education, and

WHEREAS, pursuant to N.J.S.A. 18A:11-12(2)s, an employee or member of the board of education who travels in violation of the school district's policy or this section shall be required to reimburse the school district in an amount equal to three times the cost associated with attending the event, now therefore

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Board of Education approves attendance of conferences/workshops for the dates and amounts listed for staff members and/or Board members on the attached and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that final authorization for attendance at conferences/ workshops will be confirmed at the time a purchase order is issued.

STAFF MEMBER	CONFERENCE	DATE	AMOUNT
*Tobi Knehr	2014 Coalition for Community Schools National Forum	April 8-11, 2014	\$1,936.00 (registration, transportation, lodging, meals)
Director/FSCS	Cincinnati, OH		
*Taheerah Kelly	2014 Coalition for Community Schools National Forum	April 8-11, 2014	\$1,936.00 (registration, transportation, lodging, meals)
Program Manager/21 st CCLC	Cincinnati, OH		
*AnneMarie Urgovitch	NJDOE Statewide CTE Institute	May 20, 2014	\$42.18 (transportation)
Supervisor/NCLB	Ewing Township, NJ		
*Theodore Best	Anti-Bullying & School Safety Conference	May 28-29, 2014	\$355.36 (registration, transportation, lodging)
Interim Supervisor/Culture & Climate/Anti-Bullying Coordinator	Atlantic City, NJ		
*Susana Peron	NJTESOL/NJBE	May 28-29, 2014	\$294.00 (registration)
Assistant Superintendent/DECE & Special Programs	New Brunswick, NJ		
*Rogelio Suarez	NJTESOL/NJBE	May 28-29, 2014	\$294.00 (registration)
Director/Bilingual, ESL & WL	New Brunswick, NJ		
*Rosallynn Alonso	Early Childhood Education in the 21 st Century Conference Best Practices: Putting Children First	May 30, 2014	\$75.00 (registration)
Teacher/School 18	Caldwell, NJ		
*Stephanie Mandy	Early Childhood Education in the 21 st Century Conference Best Practices: Putting Children First	May 30, 2014	\$75.00 (registration)
Teacher/School 18	Caldwell, NJ		
*Anna Adams	NJAFPA Spring Training Institute	June 4-5, 2014	\$546.55 (registration, transportation, lodging, meals)
Director/Health, Phys. Ed. & Athletics	Atlantic City, NJ		
*JoAnn Cardillo	NJAFPA Spring Training Institute	June 4-5, 2014	\$546.55 (registration, transportation, lodging, meals)
Executive Director/Principal Coaching & Evaluation	Atlantic City, NJ		
*Lori Kelly	NJAFPA Spring Training Institute	June 4-5, 2014	\$546.55 (registration, transportation, lodging, meals)
Director/Curriculum & Instruction	Atlantic City, NJ		
*Susana Peron	NJAFPA Spring Training Institute	June 4-5, 2014	\$583.72 (registration, transportation, lodging, meals)
Assistant Superintendent/DECE & Special Programs	Atlantic City, NJ		
*Rogelio Suarez	NJAFPA Spring Training Institute	June 4-5, 2014	\$583.72 (registration, transportation, lodging, meals)
Director/Bilingual, ESL & WL	Atlantic City, NJ		

Adrienne Warrick	CPR/BSL Training	June 12, 2014	\$80.00 (registration)
Physical Therapist	Teaneck, NJ		
Theodore Best	Strauss Esmay Associates 20 th Annual Educational Policy & School Law Seminar	June 13, 2014	\$50.00 (registration)
Interim Supervisor/Culture & Climate/Anti-Bullying Coordinator	Lincroft, NJ		
Carol Smeltzer	Strauss Esmay Associates 20 th Annual Educational Policy & School Law Seminar	June 13, 2014	\$50.00 (registration)
Assistant Legal Counsel	Lincroft, NJ		
Javier Godoy	Project Lead The Way	June 15-27, 2014	\$5,225.00 (registration, transportation, lodging, meals, stipend)
Teacher/ACT @ JFK	Columbia, SC		
Christine Breit	USDOE Promise Neighborhoods Project Director and National Network Meeting	June 22-25, 2014	\$1,842.00 (transportation, lodging, meals)
Supervisor/FSCS	Crystal City, VA		
Tobi Knehr	USDOE Promise Neighborhoods Project Director and National Network Meeting	June 22-25, 2014	\$1,842.00 (transportation, lodging, meals)
Director/FSCS	Crystal City, VA		
Tyeshia Hilbert	Developmental Resources National Conference : Girl Bullying & Relational Aggression	June 28 . July 2, 2014	\$1,632.50 (registration, transportation, lodging, meals)
Affirmative Action Officer	Chicago, IL		
Mary Howard	International Society for Technology in Education	June 28 . July 1, 2014	\$1,244.25
Supervisor/BTMF Academy @ JFK	Atlanta, GA		
Lauren Kazmark	Closing the Achievement Gap: Strategies for Excellence with Equity	June 29 . July 3, 2014	\$4034.50 (registration, transportation, lodging, meals)
Director of Humanities	Cambridge, MA		
Susana Peron	Closing the Achievement Gap: Strategies for Excellence with Equity	June 29 . July 3, 2014	\$4034.50 (registration, transportation, lodging, meals)
Assistant Superintendent/ DECE/Special Programs	Cambridge, MA		
Melissa Margaritis	Tomorrow's Teachers Training	June 30 . July 1, 2014	\$500.00 (registration)
Teacher/SET @ JFK	Teaneck, NJ		
MaryAnne Perrotta	17 th Annual National Principals Leadership Institute	July 11-17, 2014	\$1,875.00 (registration)
Principal/SET @ JFK	New York, NY		

Total Number of Conferences: 25
Total Cost: \$30,224.38

It was moved by Comm. Mendez, seconded by Comm. Guzman that Resolution No. 2 be adopted. On roll call all members voted in the affirmative. The motion carried.

Comm. Irving: Cheryl, can you just touch base with me tomorrow with regards to what the Board has still available in the conference line? I want to make it very clear that if there are any other conferences the Board wants to attend even for next year we can appropriate that before the end of the fiscal year. If there are any colleagues who identify any respective conferences into next year let's appropriate it now so that we don't have to necessarily dip into it for our budget items for next year.

Resolution No. 3

Purpose: Resolution of the State-Operated School District of the City of Paterson, County of Passaic, State of New Jersey, to submit a grant application for Public School Number 6 and Public School Number 15 Full Service Community Schools.

WHEREAS, a total of \$4,570,250.00 has been allocated by The Fund for the Improvement of Education (FIE), which is authorized by section 5411 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended (ESEA), supports nationally significant programs to improve the quality of elementary and secondary education at the State and local levels and help all children meet challenging academic content and academic achievement standards for the time period of up to 60 months, beginning October 1, 2014 through September 1, 2020, with the maximum funding for each award being capped at \$500,000; and

WHEREAS, the Full-Service Community Schools (FSCS) program, which is funded under FIE, encourages coordination of academic, social, and health services through partnerships between (1) Public elementary and secondary schools (2) the schools' local educational agencies (LEAs); and (3) community-based organizations, nonprofit organizations, and other public or private entities; and

WHEREAS, the purpose of this collaboration is to provide comprehensive academic, social and health services for students, students' family members, and community members that will result in improved educational outcomes for children; and

WHEREAS, the Full-Service Community Schools program is a place-based program that can leverage investments by focusing resources in targeted places, drawing on the compounding effects of well-coordinated actions. Place-based approaches can also streamline otherwise redundant and disconnected programs; and

WHEREAS, the evaluation plan describes the evaluation design, indicating: (1) What types of data will be collected; (2) when various types of data will be collected; (3) what methods will be used; (4) what instruments will be developed and when; (5) how the data will be analyzed; (6) when reports of results and outcomes will be available; and (7) how the this data will be used to monitor progress of the funded project and to provide accountability information both about success at the initial site and about effective strategies for replication in other settings;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Paterson Board of Education submit an application for a grant in the amount of up to but not exceeding \$500,000.00 to be used toward the Public School Number 6 and Public School No. 15 Full Service Community Schools for the period beginning October 1, 2014 through September 1, 2020, and authorize a contribution of matching and in-kind services as required.

It was moved by Comm. Mendez, seconded by Comm. Martinez that Resolution No. 3 be adopted.

Comm. Hodges: I'm struggling to understand why School 6 did not move into the direction of having a STEM program over there. I do understand that there was some interest in doing that but that has changed. It was changed and we had this discussion at the last presentation about this. But originally there was some talk about creating a STEM program there and that was changed to Social Justice, which caused my skin to crawl. There was some discussion about that being a STEM program and I'm far more interested in seeing that than I am Social Justice. So I'm going to vote no and hope that there are some changes.

Dr. Evans: Just to remind you, several Board members had mentioned School 6 as a strong candidate for Full Service Community Schools.

Comm. Irving: And that process has started. Let's be clear. That process began last year from what I understand.

Ms. Knehr: No. In October of this year we started and we are under way. It feels like a long time. It's already started. By securing this grant it would just make it economically more stable and more useful.

Comm. Hodges: I just want to double down on the point that you could create an environment there which supports a STEM program using the Full Service Community Schools. I will vote yes on this item, but I do want to highlight that's a continuing concern of mine.

On roll call all members voted in the affirmative. The motion carried.

Resolution No. 4

WHEREAS, the Paterson Board of Education Policy Manual received periodic revisions and additions, and

WHEREAS, the Policy Committee has reviewed policies and regulations pertaining to the Student Code of Conduct for submission to the Board for first reading, and

WHEREAS, a special public comment session will be held at the June 18, 2014, regular meeting on said policies and regulations, now therefore

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Board of Education approves the following policies and regulations for first reading:

5200	Attendance
R5200	Attendance
R5240	Tardiness
R5600	Pupil Discipline/Code of Conduct
6119	Deficit Reduction Act

FINALLY RESOLVED, that in the event any policy, part of a policy or section of the bylaws is judged to be inconsistent with law or inoperative by a court of competent jurisdiction or is invalidated by a policy or contract duly adopted by the State District

Superintendent or Board of Education, the remaining bylaws, policies, and parts of policies shall remain in full effect.

It was moved by Comm. Mendez, seconded by Comm. Martinez that Resolution No. 4 be adopted. On roll call all members voted in the affirmative. The motion carried.

Resolution No. 5

WHEREAS, the District is a State-Operated School District which has a need for architectural services; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to the Public School Contracts Law, N.J.S.A. 18A:18A-1 et seq., architectural services constitute ~~%~~professional services, and N.J.S.A. 18A:18A-5(a)(1) permits the awarding of a contract for professional services without the requirements of public bidding; and

WHEREAS, the District has used the below vendors in recent projects throughout the District and these vendors were originally engaged through the due diligence of seeking proposals and receiving responses from several architectural firms that resulted in the award of contracts to the below listed vendors; and

WHEREAS, the State District Superintendent has the authority to award contracts for professional services and to enter into contractual relationships on behalf of the District; and

WHEREAS, the District has a need to procure professional architectural services for the ~~%~~Tech Zone initiative; and

WHEREAS, awarding this contract is in line with the ~~%~~Bright Futures Strategic Plan 2009-2014, priority 4 . ~~%~~Efficient and Responsive Operations, goal 2 . ~~%~~responsiveness to current and emergent needs, now

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the following firms be appointed as Architectural Firms for the ~~%~~Tech Zone initiative pursuant to the terms of a Professional Services Agreement, for the period July 1, 2013 through June 30, 2014:

LAN ASSOCIATES 445 GODWIN AVENUE MIDLAND PARK, NJ 07432	EI ASSOCIATES 8 RIDGEDALE AVENUE CEDAR KNOLLS, NJ 07927	FLETCHER THOMPSON ARCHITECTURE- ENGINEERING 27 SCHOOLHOUSE ROAD SOMERSET, NJ 08873
---	---	--

NOT TO EXCEED \$100,000.00

It was moved by Comm. Martinez, seconded by Comm. Mendez that Resolution No. 5 be adopted.

Comm. Hodges: What is a Tech Zone?

Dr. Evans: Dr. Newell would be the better person to describe that.

Comm. Irving: Or Mr. Vroegindewey?

Dr. Evans: Okay.

Mr. Dennis Vroegindewey: Just to give you a brief description, the Tech Zone are computers lab that we are putting together to address the PARCC assessment essentially and it's in seven schools. That work is undergoing. This action is to do a second project and that is to upgrade the three hubs that we have in the district. In those hubs we have air conditioning needs and we power backup needs. Those three hubs support every school in terms of the infrastructure. Kenny can describe more because he was intimately involved in managing the hub at Eastside. I'll give him an opportunity in a second. But just to let you know, we would have started that work for the consulting firm to help design what has to be done for those upgrades but we've reached the limit on your prior action. I believe it was at the beginning of this school year. So we could not do the second project for the three hubs. Ken, I don't know if you need to elaborate or if we want to take questions.

Comm. Irving: We'll just take some more questions. Mr. Vroegindewey, where are the three hubs located in the district?

Mr. Vroegindewey: Eastside, Rosa Parks, and Kennedy High Schools. Each has a sector. For example, this building is part of Eastside's sector, so all 55 buildings that we have are divided roughly into thirds and the hubs support them. As a matter of fact, we also have some city services that are at Eastside. So when the air conditioning goes down, as Mr. Sapara-Grant knows, we have to rig up fans to keep our servers cool enough. Otherwise a third of the city goes down. This is a must-do project and we have to hire this consulting firm to spec it out and then it would go out to bid for the work to be done to do this upgrade.

Comm. Irving: Let me just ask this question because you brought it up with regards to PARCC. If that's the case, after they do the spec will there be enough time to get our data centers ready? Comm. Simmons and I had a conversation about this on the phone yesterday or even this morning. We were talking about PARCC and exactly how we're going to administer the test. The truth of the matter is many of our schools are not equipped with the electrical capacity to handle the level of testing, which would lead us to believe that we would have to have testing centers for our kids to be able to go to. So where are we with regards to that process of PARCC and identifying exactly the grade levels and where they will be taking tests next year?

Mr. Vroegindewey: We were actually prepared to do a little presentation but your agenda got overloaded. In a nutshell, we are working with the State Department and we have analyzed the district. Ralph Barca started that when he was here. We know what we need to do in terms of computers in all the schools. Every Friday we're working with a gentleman named Chris Snyder from the State Department. He's working with us and we fed all the data into a system called NJTracks that all districts in New Jersey have access to. The Tech Zone took care of those seven locations and now we're looking at the other locations as to their needs and we're going to propose that we put additional Tech Zone labs in some of these other schools. We're going to work and make recommendation to Dr. Evans to do that prior to the testing season, which I believe gets us around April. That's kind of the plan to make sure that we have enough seats during that 20-day period that they're doing the PARCC.

Comm. Irving: When will the Board know what that plan is so that we don't get caught unprepared? This is a huge assessment. Comm. Simmons kind of broke it down to me this morning about the necessity of it. I probably beat you to the punch, Kenny,

because I know you said you'd bring it up. When are we going to receive some type of report that discusses our district's capacity and preparedness to do so?

Comm. Hodges: Before he answers that, there's a larger question. We're looking to expand to tablets and all this other stuff. You need a comprehensive approach to that. That's the larger question. It's not only the testing, but our plans to expand our use of tablets and do we have the capacity to do all of that.

Dr. Evans: I think it was last fall that Ralph developed a comprehensive plan and I thought it had been shared with either the Board as a whole or one of the committees. I know it was distributed. This was last fall. It was a little booklet and Tech Zones were featured in that publication. We probably can go back through the Board minutes and tell you when it actually was presented, whether it was at one of the Board committees or the Board as a whole. He had in it what those needs are for every single school. Based on the money we had available at the time the decision was to fund seven of the Tech Zones, which means literally creating labs along with the furniture to go along with them to be able to test as it relates to and in relation to the PARCC testing that took place, to have the Tech Zones complete by then. It worked pretty well and so the challenge now is implementing the remainder. So what we need to do is bring it back to you and go through it again with you. Again, I can't remember if it went through a Board committee or whether or not it was the Board as a whole. But it was discussed and shared with Board members.

Comm. Irving: I think at this point and juncture it should be shared with the Board as a whole, given the impending nature of PARCC.

Dr. Evans: Sure. If we implement the plan, and it was very comprehensive, we should be fine in preparation for PARCC.

Comm. Irving: Is this the plan Ralph put together?

Dr. Evans: Ralph put it together. He put it together last fall.

Comm. Kerr: What this action is saying is that we have exhausted the appropriations for the Tech Zone that was considered and now we are coming back for new resources to complete or expand.

Mr. Vroegindewey: That action, to my knowledge, is allowing us to spend money that we have to have that work done. There was a limit on how much we could spend for consulting in the original action. This is allowing us to hire them to do that additional work.

Comm. Kerr: Okay. So this is in addition to what has already been.

Mr. Vroegindewey: It's just giving us permission to use the money that we already have.

Comm. Kerr: So the process is already there. It has started. We just want to cap it off. Okay. Gotcha!

Comm. Hodges: I had talked about having a tech committee before made up of Board members and the administration. There were some significant questions about where we are as a district, what our future capacity needs are going to be, and how we are set up to address those needs. If we're expanding to tablets and things, do we have the

bandwidth? Do we have the capacity to repair these things? There is a whole host of issues. Are we technologically where we need to be? I know the answer to that one right now. What can we do in a phased in process to get where we need to be? What will it cost? These are all issues that that committee could delve into. Also, more importantly to me, what's on the cutting edge? Where are we headed? What should we take part in as part of this vanguard or whatever?

Dr. Evans: There was a group that Ralph solicited input for. I don't remember the details. I know when he came to the Superintendent's cabinet to talk about it we asked and there was a list of folks. Dr. Newell, can you speak to that? Go ahead.

Dr. Laurie Newell: Good evening. We actually have biweekly technology meetings. We had one today and every time we have a meeting in-district with administrators some of the issues we discuss and we pull in principals where necessary. Some of the issues we discuss are do we have enough capacity. We review the audit. We have been updating what we update to the state in terms of what machines we have as it pertains in particular for the PARCC assessment. So if you are a school that was not doing the PARCC assessment in the field assessment this spring you were not uploaded into the system. So we went through from last fall uploading the information to the state and then we actually could get a printout to see. If we're speaking School 29, we already knew that they did not have a lab. What would we be providing for them in terms of a mobile lab? What would that look like? We actually pulled data from MIS and assessment. Those two departments worked together to merge the data so we can say in Mrs. Jones's class we have 23 students, but we only have 21 I-pads. What do we do? We mapped out all those different scenarios over this past year for the field test that we did in April and we just finished up in June. So this is what we've been doing. We had a meeting today actually at 2:00 where some of the things we identified looking for next year. What is our assessment calendar looking like? What is our school district calendar looking like? We've already noticed that there are some schools that have high populations that used to do the APA. We're now transitioning to something called DLM which is Dynamic Learning Maps. They actually have to go on to the system. One of the things we decided today is we're going to be working closely with Ms. Peron's group because we have to now see the different configurations and what you have to do with your systems if you're doing PARCC assessments versus DLM. We have schools that we've identified who are actually going to be doing DLM and PARCC on the same day using the same systems. So these are the things that we're actually going deep diving into all the potential issues that we anticipate for next year. We've reached out to three of the principals such as Cecilia O'Toole, Van Liew, and to a third school that we know have high populations who already have identified from all of our audits that they have limited labs. How are we going to be working and doing that? For this field test that we did we actually had spreadsheets up across the walls where we were able to show if you have 20 kids in a classroom and pulling the data from MIS, 15 of those kids were general education kids. We had one kid who was special education, we had one kid who was ELL, and we had another kid who was ELL special education. We actually were identifying teachers in the building who will be working with those kids to do the PARCC field test. So that's some of the work that we were doing with the field test that just passed and looking at the technology and making sure that we were ready.

Comm. Hodges: This is an area that I think requires some oversight from the Board because obviously if things don't pan out we're going to have to answer some questions about how involved we were with this process. I'm unhappy that all this is going on and I'm not at least cognizant of some of the concerns. We can advocate for more money. In fact, I'm very anxious to have the Superintendent do that given his statement regarding our thorough and efficient readiness in terms of education. We need to be

prepared for this test and we need to have an environment that's equal for all the students. You can't have them using an I-pad here and then using a PC there and think you're going to get the same kind of performance. The skills are slightly different. Even typing is slightly different. So that has to be fleshed out. I'm very anxious to put in place a committee because we have certain skills here that we shouldn't let go to waste.

Comm. Simmons: I understand everything you just said. My concern is given my recent experience with PARCC and practice testing with Texas about two weeks ago the network that's in place now is not equipped to handle it. We have to take into account that while students are testing we still have employees that are working and all of those things going on. We still have systems that are running. Can the network handle it?

Dr. Newell: Those are very valid points and those are exactly what we have been discussing since March of last year. When we did the testing for the field test that just passed the issues that we actually encountered were issues on the PARCC side. That doesn't mean that we don't have issues here, but those issues because of how we scheduled our testing we did things very staggered. We had 26 schools that we tested. We didn't have huge hiccups because of how we tested. For us to even have had a successful testing is because we pulled in MIS, the testing department, Ms. Peron's people, and Dr. Cavanna's people. So we had a whole lot of people at the table thinking about all the different scenarios. When we go full live for 55 schools for all these different assessments, then that's a valid point.

Comm. Simmons: Is there some simulation that we can put in place or something to simulate all 55 schools so that we can figure out exactly what we need? I don't think that we can figure out what we need if we haven't tested the system or pushed the network to limit. So we really don't know what we need.

Dr. Newell: I agree.

Dr. Evans: The answer is yes to your question and we'll begin that process. If you don't mind, we'll be bouncing some things off of you as well.

Comm. Simmons: If we can, do we have a timeline of when that's going to happen?

Dr. Evans: I'll need to get with Dr. Newell. I know she has a lot of material already. There are timelines, but with this added element obviously that needs to be influenced and it needs to happen sooner rather than later. For us that means working on it earlier in the summer and being ready in the fall. The Board is not meeting again until August. However, if you don't mind we can contact you offline and continue the conversation.

Comm. Cleaves: Are there any more questions?

On roll call all members voted in the affirmative. The motion carried.

Resolution No. 6

Whereas, the School Improvement Grant (SIG) for Napier Academy of Technology provides funds for student incentives based on student performance and attendance. A rubric has been established for students that meet the necessary achievement levels to be awarded an incentive.

Whereas, Napier Academy of Technology would like to provide student incentives to students who are meeting and exceeding goals and rubric requirements,

Whereas, Gerber Tours is providing transportation to Washington D.C. and accommodations for a one night stay with security for all participants. Included in the tour are meals and a tour guide of historical sites in Washington D.C. The total cost of this trip is \$9,616.00.

Be It Resolved, that the Paterson Board of Education approves this field trip for the Napier Academy of Technology students and teachers.

It was moved by Comm. Martinez, seconded by Comm. Mendez that Resolution No. 6 be adopted.

Comm. Kerr: Where in Washington are they going, just the Capital?

On roll call all members voted in the affirmative. The motion carried.

Resolution No. 7

Whereas, the District's first priority under the 2009-2014 Strategic Plan is effective academic programs; and

Whereas, the Department of Special Education has aligned its education goals and efforts to accomplish and promote high standards of academic achievement for all students; and

Whereas, the District is required under N.J.A.C. 6A:14 to ensure that the services and placement needed by each student with a disability in order to receive a free, appropriate public education are based on the student's unique needs; and

Whereas, the State District Superintendent has determined that the District is in need of independent evaluations as part of a mediation agreement, reached on March 12, 2014 to identify and provide program recommendations for student with disabilities; and

Whereas, the District Legal Counsel has reviewed the contract with Douglass Outreach at Rutgers University and found the terms to be acceptable as written;

Now, Therefore, Be It Resolved, that the District enters into contract with Douglass Outreach at Rutgers University for the 2013-2014 school year to provide (1) one psychological evaluation, (1) one educational evaluation and (1) one speech evaluation at a total cost not to exceed \$3,100.

S.C. 2053911 AUT

It was moved by Comm. Martinez, seconded by Comm. Mendez that Resolution No. 7 be adopted. On roll call all members voted in the affirmative. The motion carried.

GENERAL BUSINESS

Items Requiring a Vote

Curriculum and Instruction

Comm. Martinez: The curriculum committee met this past Monday. I beg your forgiveness. I left my minutes in my office before I rushed out to come here today. Today we are presenting Items A-1 through A-60. In lieu of me not having my notes here to go over what we discussed, it was a rather lengthy meeting. We covered a great deal of material. I'll open up the floor to any questions that we may have right now and then we can go through it.

Comm. Hodges: I'm going to break the ice for Mr. Simmons. I have a question about A-4, Career Technical Education. Is that an elective?

Dr. Anthony Cavanna: This is the course of study that the Board approves and adopts once a year.

Comm. Hodges: Is that an elective?

Dr. Cavanna: They're both electives and courses. That's a CTE course and that's one of the programming languages, Python. Students would move through a progression. They would take Window Server, C++, and then Python in order to be computer-savvy. It would be a sequence. It is a CTE course, but it is part of a sequence of courses that you would take if you're interested in computers.

Comm. Hodges: It's not really an elective. It's something that you need as a progression.

Dr. Cavanna: Right. If you want certification in that area you would need to take that course.

Comm. Hodges: Are we still using Scratch.

Dr. Cavanna: We're in the process of updating all of our curriculums. Some of them are still in the process of being updated. Some of them will be finished and ready for the Board at the next meeting to be implemented in September. Some of them we already did update. The schools are currently programming these courses.

Comm. Hodges: Will that be something for all 9-12 students, or in just one particular academy, for instance, Information Technology?

Dr. Cavanna: I believe you're right. I believe it is Information Technology, but that might not be the only school where it's being taught. You need a teacher who's been trained in that area in order to teach it. We have at least one, maybe more teachers. I don't know exactly how many teachers that would be certified to teach those subjects.

Comm. Hodges: Dr. Evans, are we pursuing someone to teach programming somewhere at least in high school that's not in that one single thread? I just can't see us having a serious Information Technology program without that.

Dr. Evans: To date we have not pursued anyone specific to programming. However, I think it was last week in our cabinet meeting we discussed the need to expand the curriculum in the CTE programs with particular emphasis on the technology program. That would be one of the things we would have to look at, but that hasn't begun yet.

Dr. Cavanna: Some of it has been done. Some of the courses have been revised, but it's in progress. We have a lot more work to do, but we have begun it.

Dr. Evans: We do know we need to do that, Dr. Hodges. We really do.

Comm. Hodges: I'm really looking for a timetable because the fact that we have to do it has been known for quite some time and I'm getting very old.

Dr. Evans: So am I.

Comm. Hodges: I can't wait much longer. I'm really at my wit's end as to how to move forward with this because I keep asking the same question. I get similar answers, but I don't see a serious attempt to address this issue and that challenges me. Quite frankly, I think it's ridiculous to have a high school program in this age and have our kids

Dr. Evans: And not have programming. I agree.

Comm. Hodges: Yes. Everywhere else around us they're doing this stuff and I don't know how much longer we're supposed to sit here and say this is okay.

Dr. Evans: Dr. Cavanna, this may be a good time to talk about the group out of Rhode Island that we're bringing in to help us to strengthen our CTE programs.

Dr. Cavanna: There are two things going on, but I need the resolution to talk about it. There are two things going on right now and the Board had already approved this year for some folks to come in and work with our high schools to shore up their sequence of courses. What they're doing is looking at all of the courses, but especially the CTE courses. They're about to make recommendations about which courses need to be revised, which need to be added, and which should be deleted. That process is coming to an end now. By June 30 we'll have a plan for each of the high schools. Each school will have an action plan for how to proceed to do the kinds of things that we're talking about now, to make sure that we have teachers trained, that we have the correct sequence of courses, that we're teaching the correct courses, and that they're leading to the correct certifications. That's in process.

Dr. Evans: Our challenge, Dr. Hodges, is to make sure that the courses are represented in that for implementation ASAP.

Comm. Hodges: The reason for my growing impatience is . you should never send me out to another conference . I spent three to four weeks working on my report because I really wanted you to see or understand what I saw. I don't know if you all had a chance to look at the sites. I know some people did and I've been running around this district showing it to everybody here. There's an 11-year-old girl who's doing programming of a microcontroller and that frustrates me. It wasn't just started. This was something that she had great facility in and we're struggling with giving our high school students the ability to do these things when your competition is down below 11 years old. They're not competing in the high school anymore. They're 11 years old doing this stuff and our kids can't. That's a disgrace. They're moving faster. They're using the language to program microcomputers to do other things and we can't teach the programming at high school. I'm ashamed. I was shocked when I saw it. We've been coming here and talking about this for years before you got here and we're still in the same spot. I'm really dissatisfied with that. I think there has to be a real global approach to technology in this district as far as what's going on in our buildings and what we're teaching in the classrooms. Quite frankly, that's where everybody else is and we can't promise to just look into it down the road anymore. We can't. That's all I have to say.

Comm. Irving: I just want to back you up on that and just say I am going to pursue the formation of at least an ad-hoc committee for the interim, maybe even a standing committee for the Board, to talk about this whole notion of technology. It's a much bigger conversation than just PARCC. It's a much bigger conversation than just our capacity for being able to field data and share data in the district. We recently had an offline conversation about our district needing its own district cloud. In addition to that, we also need to talk about how we look at technology and infuse it in curriculum. Our Smart Boards may be outdated in 10 years and if they are how are we going to do that? Are they going to be replaced by tablets? If that's the case, how are we planning to make that conversion and transition? I think all these different conversations have to be had, but they have to be had with the right folks who have the capacity to be able to deliver. We've talked about that in executive session. I'm not going to go into that any more than to just say this Board should be committed to quality, especially when it comes to areas of technology. It's not just about having internet anymore. It's so much more now.

Comm. Hodges: That's where the jobs are. We're importing people who know how to program. That's what we're doing. We can't even begin to compete. They're not learning Microsoft or whatever it is. They're learning how to program instrumentation so that they can make a table move. Personal finance, is this an elective?

Dr. Cavanna: It's a requirement. Personal finance is a requirement. All high school students have to take it.

Comm. Hodges: Okay. We still have the banking program that we haven't followed through on which we hope to build from k-12. I don't want to rehash all the things that were involved in that. So I'm hoping we can expand our view beyond what the state makes us do and try to get a foot ahead for a change instead of doing what someone else makes us do. We're always following everybody else. That's all I have.

Comm. Simmons: I see that we have a lot of advance placement, particularly in language and composition. I know we talked about it before, but I'm wondering if we have pursued the idea of articulation agreements. If a student who takes an advance placement class first they have to pass the test and if they pass the test for physics, if they're not majoring in physics in college it's useless. They don't even receive credit for it. If we pursue articulation agreements they receive that credit actually. We have the agreement with the college so that they receive that credit. So I'm wondering if we are pursuing that and if it's something we're looking at.

Dr. Cavanna: We have several articulation agreements with various colleges. We have one with Passaic County Community College and with the University of Dentistry and Medicine. Berkeley College is developing relationships with a lot of our high schools. I don't remember all the other ones, but there are a number that we're already affiliated with and we're growing that number and building those relationships. We're also getting the representatives from those colleges and universities to sit on our advisory boards at the high schools so that there's better articulation. So you're right, we should be doing more of that.

Comm. Simmons: Secondly, I don't want to beat a dead horse, Dr. Hodges, but I did notice that Word and Excel were actually separated when in reality it should be just one course where you cover Microsoft Office as a beginning class for technology. I only saw one programming class and I'm hoping that in the conversations that are taking place that there are levels of programming from entry level to advanced programming.

I'm hoping once the conversations that are taking place are done that's what we're going to see when it comes back.

Dr. Cavanna: If the Board gets a chance, on A-60 if you look towards the back there are the national standards of practice for career education. It's the attachment. You may want to take a look at that. That's one of the things that we're going to share with all the high school principals over the summer. There are certain standards that every career academy should be following. This is only a few pages here, but this is a consortium of some of the biggest and best groups in the country that have gotten together and developed these standards. There are resources online that we can bring to the high schools.

Legal

Comm. Simmons: We actually have not met. I talked to General Counsel and we will schedule a meeting for next week. There are some items that we need to discuss that we actually can't discuss here but we will discuss at our committee meeting. We do have Items B-1 and B-2 that will be presenting at the regular meeting for a vote.

Fiscal

Comm. Kerr: The fiscal committee met yesterday. Members present were Comm. Teague and myself. From the staff we had Mr. Kilpatrick and Ms. Ayala. Our meeting started with a discussion primarily on the proposed community eligibility provision to eliminate school lunch applications. According to the document that was presented this would eliminate the need to collect school meal applications to determine who is qualified to receive free and reduced lunch. The upside of the program for our district is that the raw aggregate of socioeconomic data from our district would make it possible to provide free lunches for all of our children, 100%. The downside is that the data collected from applications from the free and reduced lunch program is used not only for this program, but for other state and local programs outside of the school meal program. The fact that the School Funding Formula uses data from the free and reduced lunch program to help the state figure out budget appropriations to our district, how would we go about generating the same data? The concern for us is while the district could benefit from the new proposed system we still have a problem in generating the data, which we so heavily rely on in terms of other programs. The next thing discussed was the custodial contract. We were informed by Mr. Kilpatrick that Temco has won the custodial contract and that they will be providing custodial services for the district going forward. Mr. Kilpatrick further informed us that our insurance broker has presented him with some preliminary numbers regarding our general liability insurance. He said information will be reviewed and a decision made shortly regarding where the district will go. We were told that the district and the PEA have reached a tentative agreement regarding the teachers' contract. He said so far everything is in place pending the ratification of the rank and file membership of the union which is expected by June 22. From a year-end projection appropriation spreadsheet presented by Mr. Kilpatrick it seems things are moving in the right direction regarding the possibility of the district ending up with some fund balance surplus this year. This could be a positive outcome for the district considering the budgetary challenges which lie ahead for us. Regarding transportation, Mr. Kilpatrick presented documents which highlighted the various infractions and the charges leveled against our service providers by the district for those infractions. He said the department is still experiencing some difficulty in providing the most efficient system but this is something that they are very conscious of and something that they are working very hard to get right. We reviewed the bills list and we found everything to be in order and therefore we attached our signatures to the

document. Our meeting adjourned at approximately 8:00 p.m. We are presenting tonight from the fiscal committee C-1 through C-51.

Comm. Mendez: On C-19, can the Board get a copy of the bid to get more clarity on this bid?

Comm. Kerr: This is an action item, so you can get more information from the business department. But in terms of a discussion, I don't know. You would have to refer to the Superintendent regarding that.

Dr. Evans: I would ask for first advisement from counsel because there is the possibility that the bids may be challenged and there is a process that has to be followed. I liken it to litigation. Once you're in litigation then you're not supposed to say a lot about the subject at hand, but I would ask counsel to advise us before commenting.

Ms. Pollak: That's true. I'm sure that if you wanted to see the bid documents you could view them, but we can't discuss it. There's been a process that's already gone through procurement and if there is a challenge to that then there's a process for that as well.

Dr. Evans: And we're expecting a challenge.

Comm. Irving: I hear all that, but I want to be very clear. As a Board we still have a fundamental right to review those documents and if we think that the lowest responsible bidder hasn't been identified to make recommendations doing so. You guys are leaving that very important point out. Yes, we may not be able to discuss it, but if there are challenges or conversations or alterations to that we have the right to discuss it and make the recommendations through committee. I want to make that very clear. I'm not saying one way or another, but we also have rights as Board members to do so.

Comm. Kerr: The other thing is that when you're looking at the bid specs and everything there are a lot of things that you would have to consider in a discussion. I'm just putting this out there. It's not necessarily just the lowest bidder. There are other areas of the specs that are built into that agreement that have to be considered as we discuss.

Comm. Mendez: I totally understand that part. As Comm. Irving said, we as a Board have the right to really know who had the lowest bid and we also need to understand we have to put those considerations onto the table. I am looking forward to having more discussion.

Comm. Kerr: We can facilitate a discussion at the committee level.

Comm. Mendez: That's correct. I'm willing to.

Comm. Kerr: And we can delve into it. If you want I can set up a meeting with the BA.

Comm. Irving: We did it last year with another contract and issue. It gave us more clarity and we were able to put it through. Just personally, I want to make sure we're clear because there are always mitigating circumstances because it's always the lowest qualified bid. Someone could outbid someone else, but because they may be providing a service that the reviewers think is more credible than others it can indeed be done. I just want to make sure on all ends. I heard what you said, but I think it should be done either in the BA's office or in committee. Those are the appropriate places for the

conversation to have. If there are recommendations that come from that then they can come back to the full Board.

Comm. Kerr: Sure.

Comm. Mendez: We definitely agree. My other question is based on transportation. At the last meeting I was looking for an update on the transportation report and I would like to know if we have that.

Comm. Kerr: We did receive it in the committee and I made mention of it tonight about the infractions. The district levied some \$46,000 against the service providers because of those infractions. I don't know if you want more than that.

Comm. Mendez: I would like to have an executive session to talk about transportation. I've been expressing my dissatisfaction with the transportation department and I just want to mention what happened with me. I have three children in Paterson Public Schools and every day there is a situation with the transportation department.

Comm. Irving: I know we had asked either Captain Smith and/or Mr. Kilpatrick. I know we had some conversation about it.

Comm. Kerr: The document was presented. It was not a document that we could take out because we had to return it to the BA.

Comm. Mendez: So it cannot be presented here.

Comm. Kerr: We have the document so if you need to review it you can just call the BA and he will show it to you.

Dr. Evans: And I have a copy of it as well so you can also talk to me.

Comm. Irving: Dr. Evans, just as a follow-up to what Comm. Mendez was asking about, where are we with the whole compliance piece? I know we had talked about at the Board meeting possibly having security take over that. Have we moved anywhere with that? I know you said there was a plan presented to you, but I'm not sure exactly where we are in that process. Given the last two issues that we've had over the last two weeks that are clear and documented, I think the need is pretty apparent that we need to move forward.

Dr. Evans: We're actually getting into an area I'd prefer discussing in executive session because of litigation that we're in. I want to answer your question, but we need to discuss it in executive session.

Comm. Teague: About C-19, what do we do now? Do we vote on it tonight?

Comm. Irving: We don't vote on it until the regular Board meeting. So we have from now until the regular Board meeting to get any clarification that we need to feel comfortable to be able to vote on it at the regular Board meeting. Just one question while we're on C-19, did Mr. Kilpatrick just go through what was the process for how these bids were evaluated at all? Can you share that with the Board briefly? Ms. Ayala, could you come forward so the Board apprizes itself on how this process works?

Ms. Daisy Ayala: Good evening everyone. The process is pretty much the same for every vendor. It's advertised. Once it's advertised the time and place is given. Then

the vendors come in and through the bidding process there are people. If you look at C-19 you see the people that attended the open bidding. The packages are open and they go over the document in detail. If there is an hourly rate they go over the hourly rate. All the vendors are present and everyone has the information in front of them.

Comm. Irving: Once it's evaluated I guess however they score versus what they qualify then get forwarded to you guys?

Ms. Ayala: No. There's a committee and the people on the committee are right on the third sheet. They actually get together, they look it over, they do a comparison, and then they come out with a scoring sheet. For all of the vendors that were there, there are scoring sheets from everyone that attended. There are also comments. Whenever we arrange for you to come see the documentation you'll see that comments were made by all the persons that did the assessment of the contracts.

Comm. Kerr: There are also areas of the specs that a company can refuse from answering. They might just pass on that. You might believe that's very important to us and by default the other company might answer it and say they like that. It's a situation where you're looking for answers to what you put out there that you're looking for and if companies don't answer the questions by default the other company might get, although they might not be the lowest bidder.

Comm. Irving: Fair enough. I'm probably going to just take the liberty of checking and coming to you guys to figure out and look at it even before so I have a much more informed conversation.

Ms. Ayala: You're welcome to come. We keep the documentation. We never get rid of it, so you're welcome to come and see everything that was reviewed and everything that was presented to the committee.

Comm. Mendez: Would it be possible for Captain Smith to make a comment or opinion based on the report?

Comm. Kerr: Report on what?

Comm. Mendez: Sorry. We have to go back to executive session.

Dr. Evans: Not tonight. Remember, I just said we're in litigation.

Comm. Mendez: Never mind.

Facilities

Comm. Mendez: The facilities committee met on Monday before the regular meeting. Tonight we're presenting D-1. Are there any questions?

Policy

Comm. Simmons: We were supposed to meet today, but we couldn't because of the press conference. Actually, we voted on the policies and regulations earlier. We had already discussed those items. We voted on those for first reading and they will be brought again at the regular meeting for second reading.

Items Requiring Review and Comments

Personnel

Comm. Cleaves: Personnel did not meet so we have no report, but on the agenda they will be presenting F-1 through F-4 at the general meeting. Is there any discussion?

OTHER BUSINESS

It was moved by Comm. Martinez, seconded by Comm. Mendez that the Board go into executive session to discuss personnel. On roll call all members voted in the affirmative. The motion carried.

The Board went into executive session at 10:15 p.m.

The Board reconvened the meeting at 11:00 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 11:01 p.m.