

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

November 6, 2013 – 6:05 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. Irving read the Open Public Meetings Act:

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

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

**Workshop Meeting
November 6, 2013 at 6:00 p.m.
Administrative Offices
90 Delaware Avenue
Paterson, New Jersey**

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

Comm. Irving: Welcome everyone this evening. We know we are on the eve of a very long vacation for some of our teachers for the teachers' convention and so I want to make sure we get staff out of here in a timely fashion tonight. I am going to ask for the committee chairs when you give your committee reports if you can stay away from discussing Items 1, 2, 3, 4, and 10 and just share with the Board trying to keep to the highlights of what was discussed in your meeting - the hot ticket items, punch list items, and some of the projects that your committee is working on. I'd much prefer that to be the topic of discussion than talking about action items that happen to be here. Clearly, we're going to have a conversation about it, but let's stay on top of the bigger picture.

*Comm. Hodges enters the meeting at 6:07 p.m.

PRESENTATIONS AND COMMUNICATIONS

New Jersey Quality Single Accountability Continuum (NJQSAC) District Performance Reviews (DPRs) and Statement of Assurance (SOA) for the 2013-2014 School Year

Dr. Evans: As the Board is aware we have been working very hard to prepare for an upcoming site visit which will be a full-blown review around all five of the DPR areas in QSAC for our district for this year. This is consistent with the commitment that the Commissioner made to follow up the most recent visit with another to see if indeed we are maintaining the progress that we've made in the past. In previous meetings we provided you some information and updates and indeed some of you have been involved in some of the meetings that we've had internally to glean information from what we're doing and then there are those of you who briefed you privately on what we were doing as well. Tonight you're going to get an overview of where we are and what we've done in preparation for the upcoming visit which occurs November 19-22 from Supervisor T.J. Best. So at this point I'll turn it over to him.

Mr. T. J. Best: Thank you, Dr. Evans. Everyone should have a copy of the presentation. In addition to that, you should also have a copy of the Board resolution with the supporting documentation that includes the Statement of Assurance, the DPR, which is the District Performance Review that we're actually scored on, and you should also have a Table of Contents. The Table of Contents gives you a list of all of the documentation that we're providing as evidence for every indicator in all five DPR areas. According to state statute this has to be voted on and approved by the Board of Education and a presentation has to be done for the public. Tonight's meeting serves that purpose. Most of you know what QSAC is already, but we do have a couple of new Board members and for the public we wanted to go over just the background of QSAC. So here's our agenda. We're going to have an overview and talk more specifically about the Statement of Assurance and DPR, the role of the committee, the timeline that both the actual formal committee and subcommittee participated in to prepare all of the documentation, the role of the Board of Education, and what are the next steps in terms of verification from the Department of Education. Then we're going to finish up by comparing our past scores with our current scores. QSAC, as we know, is the evaluation and monitoring system of all public school districts in the State of New Jersey. It's the one comprehensive review that takes place to satisfy all state and federal mandated policies and procedures. This is a one-stop shop for all the evaluations that have to happen by the State by New Jersey and the federal government. QSAC evaluates school districts on five main areas – instruction and program, personnel, fiscal management, operations, and governance. It looks to see the effectiveness and the school district's preparedness in satisfying the state mandate to provide a thorough and efficient education according to the state constitution. There are three main things that have to happen as part of the QSAC legislation. First, annually the Board has to adopt a Statement of Assurance. The Board adopted a Statement of Assurance last year and in addition to that they also went through an interim District Performance Review. Without the District Performance Review you still have to do annually a Statement of Assurance. In addition to that, there's a facilities checklist that has to be done in every single school that has been done and completed by our facilities department and all schools have and are in possession of their facilities checklist. Lastly, every three years the districts are supposed to have a full QSAC review. Again, our last review that we had last year was only an interim review. This is the full review. We're part of Cycle I. Our first review was actually done in 2007. We

had a second one done in 2010. Then this is the third one that's done. We're part of Cycle I according to the State of New Jersey. The Statement of Assurance has to be approved annually by the Board of Education, which essentially is a summary document of the District Performance Review. It's also used as a supplemental document that includes their own indicators. Just to give you an example, there are five areas as we talked about. For the operations and personnel areas all of the questions that they ask are located within the Statement of Assurance. How you score yourself on the Statement of Assurance then gets transferred over to the DPR for the actual score. Annually we have to score ourselves in the areas of operations and personnel, whereas in the other areas such as instruction and program there are only a couple of questions as opposed to a full list of questions. In the District Performance Review, which is the actual score sheet, the goal is to achieve 80% out of 100% in all five areas. This is used as a self-assessment first. So the district goes ahead and we score ourselves and then the county comes in and checks it. We'll talk a little bit about the role of the committee. We also have to by statute formulate every three years a full review committee that is inclusive of the Superintendent, the School Business Administrator, the Chief Academic Officer, a Board of Education member, a teacher, and a member of the collective bargaining unit. In the district we actually had two teachers serve, one elementary and one high school. We also had two principals, one elementary and one high school. Even though these were the only positions that we had to have on the committee, we also had other people serve on the committee as well, including a person from our facilities. Cheryl Williams served as a representative of the Board Secretary and so did Dr. Newell. She served as well covering the human resources end. In addition to the formal committee that the Board has to do by state law, Dr. Evans also established a subcommittee to cover each one of the five DPR areas. Those subcommittee chairpersons were responsible for putting together all of the evidence and documentation that's reflected in the Table of Contents that you have as part of your presentation. Just to give you a quick overview of some of the things that we did, for the people who know about QSAC, it's a lot of work that goes into preparing all of these documents. After the documents were actually prepared we had several mock reviews where we went over each one of the questions and each one of the sections and we grilled each other to make sure the information that we were providing was sufficient enough.

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

Mr. Best: In some cases, such as in instruction and program, the state tells you exactly what documentation they're looking for. In other areas such as operations and personnel they don't tell you what documentation they expect from you so we have to guess on what to provide them. Since we've been through this process so many times we kind of know now what the state is looking for and as always we provide more documentation than what they actually ask for. For example, in instruction and program, they may only ask for five indicators, five pieces of information, but we provided 20 just to have that extra information there in case they ask any of those questions. In addition to the mock reviews that we had internally we're also going to conduct school visits and school reviews. This year being a full-cycle review, Mr. Rixford said that they wanted to visit our schools. Just to give you an update on what they're talking about in terms of visiting the schools for the QSAC process, they're looking at visiting approximately 80% of our schools, which comes out to about 43 schools. They want to visit 10% of the classrooms in each one of the schools. They want to spend about 10 minutes in the class and they may or may not interview students, teachers, and the principal. Just to prepare for those visits we've provided all of the principals with supporting documentation from the district level that we have prepared that the team is going to be visiting here so that they have it also at the school.

In addition to that, we've told the principals what type of internal documentation they have to provide to be prepared for those meetings. Just to give you a quick example, there's an indicator that asks for grade level meetings. We have information internally that says this is what we expect our schools to do in reference to grade level meetings. But when they go to a particular school they may ask to see the minutes and agenda of that grade level meeting and the types of things they were talking about. So we're telling the schools to be prepared with that type of information. Over the course of the next week we're going to visit the schools to make sure that they have that type of information before the state comes just to be fully prepared. We are expecting the state to come for a full visit the week of the 19th and it may go into the following week. They did say that they are going to come on November 26, but if it goes further then we're prepared for that as well. In terms of the Board of Education obviously you play a major role in the QSAC process. One of the things that we're required to do by statute is to put the Statement of Assurance and the District Performance Review online on the district's website five days prior to this meeting. We've had that on the district website on the homepage since October 31 and we've given the community an opportunity to provide comments and feedback. We also have a copy located in the front main office is anybody wanted to see it. Upon the completion of the District Performance Review the Board has to vote and approve this before we can upload it into the state website which is due on November 15. After we upload it to the state website with our self-assessment scores the county office will come in and do their onsite visit. Again, the onsite visit will consist of interviews and review of documentation at the central office, as well as visits and review of documentation at the schools. The county office then gives their own score and submits that to the Commissioner of Education. The Commissioner of Education can rectify those scores. He can either accept them or change them. Then he will submit a letter of placement on the continuum. We've received the letter of placement on the continuum in February that actually called that we have this review to the done coming up this month. Here's a history of our scores. As you can see, we've made great progress in all five DPR areas. In 2007 was the first review. We were actually the first school district in the State of New Jersey to go through a QSAC review. This year for our QSAC review we'll also be again the first one to go through it. I just want to point out the last section. In our last interim review we got four out of five areas. Because it was so recent a lot of the same information that we provided last time will also be the same information that were providing now. Even though the scores fluctuate in that last area for all four questions we only had one question wrong. So for all four areas where we scored over 80 points there was only one question that was scored wrong. But because each indicator is weighted and there are less questions in some areas if you get one wrong it's worth 20 points. That was the case in fiscal. If you get one wrong in operations it's only worth 5 points because there's a lot more questions in operations than there are in fiscal. For our current district performance score you can see them here.

*Comm. Guzman enters the meeting at 6:22 p.m.

Mr. Best: We went up in every area. Instruction and program was a big jump and that's due to a lot of work that the school district has been doing. In fiscal management we've actually maintained the same score. Then in the areas of governance, operations, and personnel where there was only one question that we got wrong last year we improved upon those scores. So again, there was just one question that we got wrong and as a result of rectifying that over the course of the last several months it caused us to get 100 in each one of those three areas. That concludes the presentation. If the Board had any questions, I'd be free to answer those.

Comm. Mendez: According to your knowledge of this process, how much progress do you think we have made on instruction and program?

Mr. Best: For that I'm actually going to ask to have Dr. Cavanna – if it's okay with Dr. Evans – come up and just talk about the difference in the score that we received last time until now.

Dr. Anthony Cavanna: Most of the score for instruction and program is based on our test scores. We don't have any control over that, but we do have control over the other indicators. So we went through and we meet all the other indicators according to our self-study. The state may agree or disagree, but that 67 is the most points that we could possible get because of our standardized test scores.

Comm. Mendez: In terms of regaining partial local control, I would like to hear your comments based on the score that we already have, having 100% on three of the categories and 86% on fiscal management. I would like to hear what the possibility is for us to regain partial local control in those four categories.

Mr. Best: I'm going to defer that to Dr. Evans. He's had some conversations with the Commissioner in reference to that.

Dr. Evans: What you're requiring me to do is make an educated guess. That's hard to do because only the team will do the scoring and then the Commissioner will review those scores and determine whether or not, as Mr. Best has indicated, he accepts them or modifies them. I think we're in very good shape. I have all of that information myself. It's all been reduced to soft form, meaning it's on computer. One of the things I'm going to be doing over the next few days is reviewing every DPR and every document that's there to support the DPR. Then I may be in a better position to answer your question. I've sat through some of the internal meetings. The ones that I didn't participate in Ms. Shafer did and we both feel pretty good about what we have. But again, we're not the visiting team. We can look at our information through the lens that we think they're going to be looking through, but we're not them.

Comm. Mendez: Thank you for your answer. I really think that after the visit and after we get the final results we have to have a really serious conversation about regaining partial local control in all those categories. I believe that those numbers reflect the progress that we have made.

Comm. Martinez: Just to piggyback off that, I know the last time we collectively met with Commissioner Cerf one of the things he indicated he wanted to see was us conducting more professional development and the retreat that we had a couple of weeks back at Seton Hall met that requirement. I think there was one more that he asked of us as well, which could possibly be scheduled for December. To your point, if our scores are where they need to be and we're meeting his additional requirements I think we should be in good standing, as Dr. Evans indicated. Mr. Best, you said they would be visiting up to 80% of the schools and 10% of classroom students and teachers. This is a new practice. This is not in keeping with prior visits?

Mr. Best: In terms of full visits, the first visit in 2007 was this process. There was actually a team from Montclair State University that was hired as consultants. When we first did it in 2007 it was a pilot program. Since then a lot of stuff has changed, even the questions that they ask. So they went from 357 indicators down to about 56, but a lot of the same content is the same stuff. They're asking fewer questions, but they expect

more out of it. Every process is different. Because it's a full review they do have the ability to go in and check with schools.

Comm. Martinez: Have they conducted those visits in the schools prior to this?

Mr. Best: Not since 2007.

Comm. Martinez: Is that typical in other districts as well?

Mr. Best: I'm not sure. I think we're the first one in the state that's starting this cycle. This is considered Cycle I. We're the first one in the state. Just to give you a little bit of background of the team that's coming to visit, it's a combination of executive county superintendents and their staff from essentially throughout North Jersey. There are a couple of members from Sussex County, Essex County, as well as members from Passaic and Bergen County executive superintendents' offices that are coming to do the visit. I think they're working as a team and for larger districts they're going to be moving into doing the same thing in other districts.

Dr. Evans: I would add that the process being used here this year is the same process that will be used in every school district across the state. I was advised of that. We asked the question and as Mr. Best just mentioned the process has been used once in our district. There are some in the room that were a part of that visit and remember them visiting their schools. In fact, I'll just identify Ms. Santa as having been a principal at the time that occurred because she has reflected on that when they did visit the schools, classrooms, talked to students, talked to teachers. Then the visits that have occurred since then were different. Now they're going back to that, but they're going back to it statewide, not just here.

Comm. Martinez: I don't know if we have this information. What kinds of questions are they asking students and teachers? Do we have any idea what they're looking for?

Dr. Evans: As it was explained to me, and I'm the first to say that Mr. Best has had more conversation and has more information and can better answer your question than I can, but I will begin and he can add if he'd like. The purpose of the visits is to follow up on the information that we've said that we are doing. If we provide evidence that we're meeting a standard, that's evidence. Then the question is, is it really happening in the field? Is it really happening in the school, implementation? That's what they're checking when they go out to schools and talk to teachers. Are they really doing this? Do you really have the curriculum? Are you implementing this particular standard the way the district office said you were? That's part of it. Mr. Best, you can enhance or add to that.

Mr. Best: Essentially that's what they're doing. We still don't have information yet on whether or not they're going to do just instruction when they go visit the school or if it's going to be a review of all five areas. In the past what they did in 2007 is they had a team go in to focus on all five areas. In addition to visiting the classroom and finding out whether or not instruction was taking place and asking the teacher whether or not they had all of the curriculum in place and reviewing their lesson plans, which we know for a fact is going to happen, we don't know if in addition to that they're also going to go to the central office of the building and ask the principal questions around operations, if they're going to have interviews around bullying with students just to find out who they know to talk to if they're being bullied and what happens in the event a student is being bullied. In terms of facilities in the past they would have a person that would actually do a walk-through of the building with the chief custodian to determine whether or not they were

actually following everything on that facilities checklist. So we still haven't gotten clarification but we prepared for all of that. So we're prepared for a full visit. In addition to the documentation that we're producing at the school level we're giving all that documentation to the principals, but we're also asking the principals to prepare their own documentation to show how it's specific to their school.

Comm. Simmons: You kind of touched on a little bit of what I was going to ask. How confident are we that the schools are prepared to supply the information that you mentioned like grade level meeting minutes? How confident are we that they'll have that information?

*Comm. Kerr enters the meeting at 6:32 p.m.

Mr. Best: I just want to start by saying the state is aware of our current situation in the district. There are a lot of things happening simultaneously. Obviously if the team is prepared to interview with teachers the team understands that there are some issues with the teachers around the contract and there are some serious contract negotiations occurring right now. So they're prepared for whatever questions and answers they may get from the teachers in that perspective. In addition to that, we have a lot of new principals in the buildings. I think there are about 18 new principals that are at new sites or new to the district overall. So in those cases they can only talk about what they've done that year. They can't tell them what happened two or three years ago. Also, we have RACs in some of our schools. The county team obviously has experience with the RAC teams and the RACs have made some recommendations of what to do in the particular schools. The process of visiting the schools doesn't include interviews with the RACs, but you have to expect that some of that information may be transmitted over to Mr. Rixford. I think that at our school level our principals are really prepared. Our teachers if they want to answer the questions they're prepared as well. Then they're also going to interview students. The type of questions they're going to ask the students just came directly from Ms. Witt who will be coordinating the visits. She said she just wants to know three things from the students. What are you learning? Is it useful or helpful? If you don't know what you're learning, how do you get the answer? They've asked these questions in the past. She said she's going to ask them again to students just to kind of get a feel of what's going on there. Our principals have been prepared. They go through CAPA walk-throughs. They have other processes like QSAC. QSAC is very comprehensive, but they're used to these types of things and I think our principals are really prepared.

Comm. Simmons: Secondly, can you take me through what the school mock reviews are going to look like?

Mr. Best: There's going to be a team of about seven or eight people from the district that are going to go into a select number of schools. Right now we have six schools that we plan on visiting. We may want to visit more schools. The team is going to go in and ask the questions that we think the state is going to ask. We're going to sit down with the principals to find out if they have that type of information that we're asking them to have. We may throw in a couple of curveball questions. To better be prepared you practice better than what you think the game is going to be. So we're expecting it to be probably harder on the principals in our mock review than we're expecting the county to be just so that they're really prepared. We're taking a mixture of the type of schools that we're visiting. We're going to high schools, elementary schools, k-8 schools, and also alternative schools. Just to kind of get the feel for it we're also going to High-Performing Schools, Priority, and Focus Schools. The state said they want a big picture of the

entire district. They don't want to just go to all the failing schools. They're going to 80% of the schools.

Comm. Teague: Commissioner Cerf works for the Governor so he can't override any of the Governor's decisions. At the last town hall meeting he came to Paterson and he said that he wanted to return local control but he wasn't just going to throw up his hands and give it over to us even though it's been a failure of the last 20 years. So what can we do now since he's back in office again to try to get through to Christie that we need local control? Christie is pretty much saying under no uncertain terms is he prepared to give it back to us.

Mr. Best: I just wanted to make this quick statement that the QSAC process is an evaluation process. It doesn't automatically guarantee that you're going to get local control. We can get 100 in every area for the next 5 or 10 years and it doesn't mean that they're going to turn over local control. As what happened in Newark the Supreme Court of the State of New Jersey decided that it's up to the discretion of the Commissioner. That's the way the state regulation is actually written. The discretion of the Commissioner will determine whether or not a school district receives partial withdrawal, meaning that they would give us local control in one particular area, or full control. I think in previous meetings Commissioner Cerf has made an indication that he would like to see the district return to local control in certain areas. He specifically said operations and personnel. We're highly aware that he said that so we're putting a lot of effort into our operations and personnel, even more so than we would normally do.

Comm. Hodges: Are we being asked to vote on this tonight?

Mr. Best: Yes.

Comm. Hodges: Is there a rush? I haven't read any of this.

Mr. Best: There is a rush. We had to move the meeting up only because the Board of Education won't have another meeting before November 15. It's due to the state by November 14. You're voting that you received it and you're voting on the scores. But you still have an opportunity to provide input on the actual scores. On any of the indicators you can still provide input all the way up until we submit it on the 15th.

Comm. Hodges: These people are coming to speak with our children. Do they need permission slips to do that?

Dr. Evans: No. As long as they are representatives of the Department of Education, the county executive office, or the district they don't.

Comm. Hodges: You had mentioned the court case was argued on very narrow lines. In fact, the judge wondered out loud why if certain things were not in evidence why wasn't that the Commissioner's responsibility. She could not act on it because that was not within the complaint. So the question then is if you tailor your complaint that addresses the fallacy of the entire QSAC process would that not be more successful? The reason the court case in Newark and in Paterson failed was because, as you correctly stated, the question that they were asked to address only hinged on the Commissioner's ability to give his approval of our performance. That's why it failed. This is due the 15th?

Mr. Best: Yes.

Comm. Hodges: Okay. That's all.

Comm. Irving: Are there any other questions? I just have one question and one recommendation. When the representative staff members from the state come to go through the DPRs, who is going to be with them during the process of them going through the packets?

Mr. Best: Each one of the chairs. They actually asked to have a pre-meeting the same way we did last year where their team will come in and meet with the team representatives from the district just to have a pre-meeting to talk about what the rest of the week will look like to establish the tone. This entire process, unlike previous years, is all digital. All of the information has been scanned online and is available on a network drive that each one of the team members will have access to. As they have questions we're providing them with all of the information prior to the time that they get here. So if there are any questions that they have we're hoping that they ask the question, if they are looking for additional information or if they want to meet with somebody specifically we're hoping that they ask us that beforehand. But for each one of the five indicators there is a chairperson and then that chairperson has other people who are responsible for answering those indicators and that entire team will be available. Just as an example for operations, Mr. Luis Rojas is the chairperson, but there are 17 people who contributed information for indicators. So all 17 people in addition to Mr. Rojas, myself, Dr. Evans, and Ms. Shafer will be available to answer any questions around operations.

Comm. Irving: For that meeting, I just want to make sure that I'm there. Cheryl, can you just make sure that gets on my calendar for that meeting? I invite any other Board member who might be free to join us for that as well.

Comm. Hodges: I certainly would like to.

Comm. Irving: Great. I just want to talk briefly about the Board presence during the review. One of the things that I did last year is I sat in on the review for personnel and operations. I sat with the county folks and had some great conversation with them from the Board's perspective while they reviewed. I encourage the Board to be around and make their presence known, not interjecting in the process, but certainly evaluating and going through with the respective staff members. I sat with Dr. Newell during the review of personnel last year and I think we had a very good discussion. I think it helps to have that other level of oversight that happens to be in the room as well. So that's just as a point of information for everyone that's here.

Comm. Hodges: We had gotten approval from the state to establish a sign-off sheet. Some of you will recall that. Is that still in place? Given that it is digitalized at this point, is there a mechanism to make sure that there's no question as to whether or not they received the information? There's so much information there I don't want them to be confused into thinking that they hadn't received something that we actually had in our possession.

Mr. Best: The purpose of the Table of Contents is to actually give them that. They won't be able to review the documentation until they get here, but they will know what documentation is available to them prior to their visit. So when we submit the Statement of Assurance and the District Performance Review, and I'm hoping to do it before November 15, we will also submit the Table to Contents that lists all of the indicators, a summary of how we're answering that question, and a list of all of the evidence that we're willing to provide to answer that question. They will then have a

chance to come back to the district and say, "We think you should add this or we really want to meet with this person to verify if that's going on." So they will have a chance to review it prior to.

Comm. Hodges: I'm sure that there are materials that we thought were appropriate that they might have had a difference of opinion on. Have we made adjustments for those kinds of discrepancies?

Mr. Best: There's a new set of eyes this year. The team is different. So we can just go off what we did last year. Our last year visit went extremely well. All of the documentation that we provided last year we're providing this year in addition to new documentation. So if we got a 95% in operations last year with all of the documentation we provided we didn't just rest on our laurels. We went ahead and we provided additional documentation on top of that just to be prepared for whatever questions may come before us. But we don't know exactly what they're going to ask.

Comm. Hodges: But this is a full review as opposed to a partial review, which is my concern.

Mr. Best: Yes. Last year was a partial review, but it was conducted as a full review in terms of review of documentation. For a partial review, again it's up to the Commissioner's discretion how frequently he visits a district and what types of questions he wants to ask the district. But normally a partial review or an interim review will only be the questions that you got wrong for that particular district performance area. They changed the actual QSAC documentation. If you remember last year we went from all of those questions down to a narrow one. They didn't want to just ask us the questions we got wrong. They wanted to do the full review, but it was seen as an interim review not a full review because it wasn't the three-year cycle.

Ms. Shafer: If you look at your packet about three quarters of the way through you'll see it starts with instruction and program. Those are all the indicators and all the evidence that's listed. It's at the back of the packet. Then there are the five areas with all the evidence.

Comm. Cleaves: Is it possible to provide us with a schedule of dates and times of who they will be meeting with so if we wanted to sit in we could make ourselves available?

Mr. Best: We haven't gotten that schedule yet. We may not even know until the day that they actually come to visit. All we know is that on November 19 at 8:30 in the morning they want to have a pre-meeting with the team from the district. If we have that schedule provided and if Dr. Evans wants to share that, I think he will.

Dr. Evans: Sure. Were you also inquiring about the school visits?

Comm. Cleaves: No, just the visits here.

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

Mr. Best: Mr. Gilmartin did say that as part of his governance review he wanted to meet with Board members. He said definitely the Board President, but he may want to meet with other Board members as part of the governance review.

Comm. Irving: Gilmartin or Scott?

Mr. Best: I'm sorry. Mr. Rixford.

Comm. Martinez: Are we able to attend the meeting on the 19th as long as it's not a quorum issue?

Mr. Best: Yes.

Comm. Kerr: Mr. Best, I know that the reviews are different this year than they were in the past. There are some new pieces that were not done in the past that they have introduced. Regarding the interviews, they will be interviewing students and principals and teachers. Can you tell me how will all of that score in that DPR? Also, how will the interviews be taking place? Will we have members from the district there to observe what is done in the interviews?

Mr. Best: I'll answer the second question first. In terms of the school visits and the interviews, that's still very vague. We're hoping for more clarification, but we don't know what schools they're going to visit. We don't know who they plan on meeting with when they go to the schools. All they said is that they may or may not meet with students, teachers, and the principal. We know definitely that they're going to schools. We know definitely that they're going to sit in classrooms. But who they talk to it may be different from school to school. At one school they may ask to meet with the principal and at another school they may not ask to meet with the principal. In terms of how the school visits impact the actual DPR score, in the past we've only been evaluated on whether or not we were able to produce the documentation to show that we're fulfilling the requirements of the indicator. Now they want to see whether or not it's being implemented within the school. So we may say that we have grade level meetings that views assessment data to determine whether or not students should be promoted or require additional interventions. We have a lot of training that's been conducted on a district level. We have a lot of information that's provided to teachers around grade level meetings as well as assessment data that we give to the schools. But when they go to the school they want to see the actual agenda and the minutes that it took place. If they visit 43 schools there may be a case that two out of the 43 schools don't have it. We don't know whether or not they're going to say, "Two schools don't have it so you don't get credit for the entire section," or if they're going to say, "It's only two schools – it's not a big deal." We don't know how they're going to score that, but if they wanted to say if one school doesn't have it then you don't fulfill the requirements, they can do that.

*Comm. Simmons leaves the meeting at 6:50 p.m.

Comm. Kerr: Don't you think we should at least know exactly how we are being scored and what they need for the review so we can prepare ourselves? I mean, they're going to be doing something that we're not quite sure how to address.

Mr. Best: I really don't think they know exactly what they're doing yet either. This is the first time that this entire group is coming together to do this process. It's being led by Mr. Rixford. Mr. Rixford is in communications with Dr. Evans. Members of Mr. Rixford's staff are in conversation with myself and Ms. Shafer. As we come closer to the date we'll find out more details, but right now we just don't know all of the details. All we can do is fully prepare our schools in the district by providing them all of the information that they may need.

Comm. Kerr: But if they are going to interview our kids what kinds of questions are they going to be asking? Can they ask questions that they might not know and give the

wrong answers and the answers that they give impact us? We should at least know exactly what is being asked of the kids. What are the types of questions they will be required to answer?

Dr. Evans: Mr. Best gave you three questions a moment ago that Diane Witt is going to ask around curriculum and instruction. You may want to repeat those.

Mr. Best: What are you learning? Is it useful? If you don't know, who do you talk to? Again, that's around instruction and program. We know they're going to ask those questions. They may ask questions around other areas. Again, I'm just using bullying as an example. They may ask the student, "If a kid picks with you in class, who do you talk to? Is there somebody that you go to?" In the high school level they may ask a student, "If you think that one of your friends is using drugs or alcohol, who do you talk to?" For that we have SAC representatives at most of our schools, but are all 30,000 students going to be asked those questions? I don't think so. It's just the luck of the draw.

Comm. Kerr: In general, is this information passed on to our kids? If you're bullied, what do you do? What is being taught? If you have problems, who do you go to? Are our kids able to answer those questions?

Dr. Evans: I would say generally yes. A kid who may have just enrolled in our schools may not because their first day was today or yesterday. But principals are required to inform students. That's an extension of the student code of conduct. Nonetheless, they are required to make that information available to students and teachers.

Comm. Kerr: But would you be surprised if they could not answer those questions?

Dr. Evans: Yes, I would.

Mr. Best: Things such as bullying and some of the other policies that we have to have are all included in the student code of conduct and student handbooks. They give those to the parents and the students at the beginning of the school year and then the parents have to sign off that they actually received them. So the principals will have on file – and these are the things that we're telling the principals to have ready – the sign-off sheet that they did in fact receive the policy around bullying, that they did in fact receive other policies and procedures. So if they go and ask a student did you ever get this and the student says no, or if they ask a teacher and the teacher says they don't know anything about that, they can then go to the principal and the principal will have evidence because they have the sign-off sheets.

Comm. Kerr: I understand that. But where do you go from there? You ask the kid and the kid says he doesn't know and can answer. The teacher has a log that states that they got that information. How do you score that? That's the point I'm trying to make. Where do you go? I understand what you're saying. The principals might have the information. The school might have the information. The child might have the information, but answer incorrectly. How is that being scored? That's all I'm saying.

Mr. Best: Just to kind of wrap up other types of questions like that, it's really up to the discretion of the interview team on a lot of these things. This process isn't designed as a "gotcha" process where they're coming in and they're trying to find you doing something wrong. I think that the Commissioner in his last visit as well as his letter expressed the interest of working with the district to help them to return some aspects of local control. In some of the cases because we have RACs in the schools they want to

show that what they have been putting in the schools has been beneficial. So if they have a team from the county or the state that's been working in the school they're not going to go out and say none of this stuff is happening because it's a bad reflection on them. I think that there is a willingness and good faith that they will score us fairly.

Comm. Irving: Thank you, Mr. Best. Do we need to adopt this now? Is that on the agenda?

Mr. Best: During the course of the public portion we have to allow people to comment on it.

REPORT OF STATE DISTRICT SUPERINTENDENT

Dr. Evans: I have no additional items to report.

PUBLIC COMMENTS AND SPECIAL SESSION ON POLICIES FOR SECOND READING

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

Comm. Irving: I just want to remind our speakers while we're waiting for the list that we ask everyone for a three-minute time limit and when you hear the bell that will be the completion of the time that happens to be there.

(No speakers)

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

RESOLUTIONS FOR A VOTE AT THE WORKSHOP MEETING

Resolution No. 1

BE IT RESOLVED, that the list of bills and claims dated October 30, 2013 in the grand sum of \$4,536,268.33 beginning with vendor number 221 and ending with vendor number 799535 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.

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

Comm. Hodges: Pass.

Comm. Kerr: Yes.

Comm. Martinez: Yes.

Comm. Mendez: Yes.

Comm. Teague: Yes.

Comm. Hodges: 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.

Total Number of Conferences: 11
Total Cost: \$1,680.00

STAFF MEMBER	CONFERENCE	DATE	AMOUNT
*Laurie Newell	Preparing for Online Assessments - PARCC	October 30, 2013	\$75.00 (registration)
Chief Reform & Innovation Officer	Oradell, NJ		
Dewitt Evering	HSC Workshops: Classroom Management and Effective Teaching of Children and Adolescents with Emotional and Behavioral Problems	November 11, 2013	\$139.00 (registration)
Principal/ACT @ JFK	Totowa, NJ		
Gregg Festa	HSC Workshops: Classroom Management and Effective Teaching of Children and Adolescents with Emotional and Behavioral Problems	November 11, 2013	\$139.00 (registration)
Principal/PANTHER Academy	Totowa, NJ		
Pamela Powell	HSC Workshops: Classroom Management and Effective Teaching of Children and Adolescents with Emotional and Behavioral Problems	November 11, 2013	\$139.00 (registration)
Principal/BTMF @ JFK	Totowa, NJ		
Judith Rhodes	HSC Workshops: Classroom Management and Effective Teaching of Children and Adolescents with Emotional and Behavioral Problems	November 11, 2013	\$139.00 (registration)
Supervisor/BTMF @ JFK	Totowa, NJ		

Janet Abyad	Ideas Unlimited Seminars: Behavior Interventions that Work	November 12, 2013	\$180.00 (registration)
Teacher/BTMF @ JFK	Edison, NJ		
Azza Eltawil	Ideas Unlimited Seminars: Behavior Interventions that Work	November 12, 2013	\$180.00 (registration)
Teacher/BTMF @ JFK	Edison, NJ		
Leke Gashi	Ideas Unlimited Seminars: Behavior Interventions that Work	November 12, 2013	\$180.00 (registration)
Teacher/BTMF @ JFK	Edison, NJ		
Jorge Osoria	Ideas Unlimited Seminars: Behavior Interventions that Work	November 12, 2013	\$180.00 (registration)
Vice Principal/BTMF @ JFK	Edison, NJ		
Denny Sylver	Ideas Unlimited Seminars: Behavior Interventions that Work	November 12, 2013	\$180.00 (registration)
Teacher/BTMF @ JFK	Edison, NJ		
Laurie Newell	Common Core & PARCC – Reading & Writing Grounded in Formational Text	December 6, 2013	\$149.00 (registration)
Chief Reform & Innovation Officer	Eatontown, NJ		

****For ratification***

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

Resolution No. 3

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

WHEREAS, the Policy Committee has reviewed the Policy 2361 for submission to the Board for first reading due to minor changes, now therefore

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Board of Education approves the following policy for first reading:

2361 Acceptable Use of Technology and Social Media

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. Guzman that Resolution No. 3 be adopted. On roll call all members voted in the affirmative. The motion carried.

Resolution No. 4

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

WHEREAS, as part of Cohort I, Paterson Public Schools is scheduled to be monitored during the 2013-2014 school year and must submit the DPR and SOA to the NJDOE via NJ Homeroom by November 15, 2013 and the State District Superintendent has convened a committee to assist in completing the DPR in accordance with N.J.A.C. 6A:30-3.1(b)-(e), and

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

WHEREAS, the district board of education has complied with the following procedures with respect to this meeting:

1. The district board of education shall post the proposed responses to the District Performance Review and declaration page on its Internet website at least five working days prior to the date fixed for the hearing, and shall make it available for examination by the public at the district board offices or another reasonable location;
2. The district board of education shall cause notice of the meeting to be published as required by the Open Public Meetings Act, N.J.S.A. 10:4-6 et seq., and this notice shall inform the public that the District Performance Review and declaration page will be discussed at the meeting and the times and manner in which members of the public may view the proposed responses to the District Performance Review; and
3. At the public hearing, the district board of education shall provide the public with the opportunity to comment and be heard with respect to the proposed responses to the District Performance Review. The district board of education shall also provide the public with the opportunity to submit written comments prior to the meeting.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Board of Education approves the submission of the NJQSAC DPR and SOA.

It was moved by Comm. Martinez, seconded by Comm. Mendez that Resolution No. 4 be adopted.

Comm. Cleaves: So we're just voting that we received the Statement of Assurance?

Comm. Hodges: No. It says "approve."

Comm. Irving: Mr. Best, we have to approve it?

Mr. Best: Yes.

Comm. Irving: So we're voting that we are approving the Statement of Assurance. Are there any other questions?

Comm. Mendez: He also mentioned that we're going to be able to comment and go back and make any recommendations if we need to.

Mr. Best: We're not going to submit until probably the 14th. I don't want to wait until the 15th. We'll probably submit on the 14th but you can make comments as well as the community can submit comments in writing all the way up until the time. You're really voting on the scores. So either we have the information or we don't. In terms of the types of documentation that we're going to provide, that can change.

Comm. Mendez: Got it.

Comm. Irving: Are there any other questions?

On roll call all members voted as follows:

Comm. Cleaves: Yes.

Comm. Guzman: Yes.

Comm. Hodges: Notwithstanding a very fine presentation, I have not read this document and therefore I don't feel comfortable in voting for it. I abstain.

Comm. Kerr: Yes.

Comm. Martinez: Yes.

Comm. Mendez: Yes that I received the document.

Comm. Teague: Yes.

Comm. Irving: Yes.

The motion carried.

GENERAL BUSINESS

Items Requiring a Vote

Curriculum and Instruction

Comm. Martinez: As per the directive that was given earlier, I will leave the floor open for any questions pertaining to the action items. In the minutes reflected in front of you guys there are some questions and comments and maybe they will answer those. First, we'd like to dive into some of the larger issues that we discussed at the curriculum committee meeting and then we can circle back. We started off the meeting discussing some of the directive. Mr. Suarez gave a presentation on World Languages focusing on the shift that was taking place. He emphasized using the word "shift" because it wasn't so much of a change in the curriculum but a shift from focusing solely on the grammatical, written, and spoken aspects of World Languages to pulling it back in context to incorporate larger cultural aspects as well. Whereas the focus is not to

eliminate the grammatical aspects, but more to just pull it back and make that a larger component of what's being instilled for the World Languages. That's Spanish, Italian, Arabic, and French. He gave a pretty thorough presentation regarding that. Mr. Kerr and I both agreed and our old school mentality kicked in where we felt the grammatical piece and the verbal piece should still be highly emphasized, but also understanding this pretty much came from the change in Common Core Standards, which necessitated to pull it back in context so it's not solely focused on those aspects but make it more of a holistic kind of thing.

Comm. Hodges: Before you move on to another point, this is my concern. I agree with the two of you. My understanding of the Common Core Standards is that they were going to reduce the number of topics but give you greater intensity on the ones that you are covering. So I would have thought that as a result of that there would be an inclusion of culture which does exist now. You're intensifying culture, but I wouldn't look for a diminution of the attention that's paid to grammar. That does concern me since that is the scaffold from which you can approach the language. If you understand the grammar you can then at least attempt to speak. So I'm a little unclear as to...

Comm. Martinez: To my understanding it wasn't so much neglecting those aspects. The focus is clearly still there, but it's just kind of pulling it back in context so as to incorporate other cultural aspects such as holidays, foods, and celebrations to kind of give them a greater understanding of how to apply what they're learning grammatical, verbally, and so on in other areas within the culture of that specific language that they are learning. To your point, we kind of felt the same thing in the sense that the focus should not be neglected in teaching them how to conjugate the verbs correctly. It's not that those things are now off the table, but it's just being put in a larger context. That was the way that it was delivered to us. That was the first presentation, the large bucket area that we talked about there. Another thing that came to the table and was pretty involved, earlier on we were talking about the use of personal assistants in the classroom. These numbers are probably not accurate so I'll just use these as examples. In the beginning of the school year there was a request for 70 personal aides throughout the district and that number was driven down to somewhere like in the mid 30's. But then we saw from the beginning of the school year until now a significant increase in the request for those personal aides. So we were discussing certain areas and why there was such a dramatic increase, almost 100%. I don't know the exact numbers, but there was a significant increase in the amount of personal aides. Fiscally it's not sustainable. The money is not there to support the need for that many personal aides. There was a lot of discussion around that need for personal aides and that was something that was thoroughly discussed there. The last thing that we discussed was the new report cards and the change in the format of the report cards. It was indicated that the report cards we were using were still rather antiquated and in need of changing, but it was really further moved along by the Common Core Standards as well. What was being reflected in the old report cards we were using wasn't really indicative of the standards and what they were looking for. We discussed that. Dr. Cavanna indicated were hoping to have something in front of us today, but we all agreed in the meeting that we didn't want to rush an unfinished product to the table. He requested to have until the next meeting to fine tune and refine it a little more so he could present it to us. The notion was to not rush something out like an unfinished product, but take the time and make sure it's what it needs to be before we put it forth.

Comm. Hodges: I have a real concern about this. I've actually been called to become involved in a situation with a young man who's in high school and the family was under the impression that the child was doing well educationally because they were getting the notices back that said things were going well. Then recently it was brought to light that

he hadn't taken the STAR assessment and he had failed certain courses and there were days missing where he hadn't been to school. The family is sitting there saying, "You were sending me notices that these things are in place." I don't know how they're supposed to react now if the child is suddenly held to account for failing the year when they had no idea. This is over the course of the year that he was in this state. I think that's a real problem because this isn't the first case that I'm hearing about it. There doesn't seem to be a correlation between what's going home and what's actually being kept in terms of records. I don't know how a parent responds to that and addresses that in a reasonable fashion.

Dr. Evans: They should contact us. I would like to know who that parent is if that's happening and the school that it's happening in. I can't deal with what I don't know. That's the bottom line. If either Mr. Johnson or Ms. Santa knew about it they would be on it. Step one, the parent needs to contact us.

Comm. Hodges: I have actually sent some of those things along, but there's a little bit more complexity in this that we were discussing in terms of the parents. My general question is, is that happening and it seems to be. So it's not just the one case. That's the issue. You have parents coming down to the meeting complaining about the very same thing and what I'm saying to you is I'm still seeing that. Is this new report card...

Comm. Martinez: Going to be reflective of working to resolve that problem?

Comm. Hodges: Absolutely. That's my question.

Comm. Martinez: That's a valid question.

Comm. Irving: The tool is still being created. Am I correct?

Ms. Shafer: Yes. These are two different issues. One is a progress report going out where the parent is told everything is okay and then creating new report cards. So if a progress report is going out saying that the child is doing everything right two things could be happening. Either between the time that the progress report goes out and the end of the marking period something goes astray and then the report card would reflect something different. But if it's that the student didn't take the STAR assessment and then they get a progress report saying everything is fine we need to know what school that is and who the student is so we can follow up. It shouldn't happen to anybody, but if you're saying this is happening in other places we need to know to address that. Progress reports are supposed to tell parents how they're doing halfway through the marking period, good or bad, so the parents can get involved and address the bad so that at the end of the marking period things pick up. If we can get that information, then that would be helpful. Will the new report card address that? The progress reports will be aligned with the new report cards, but it's not going to address someone giving good progress reports when in fact there shouldn't be a good progress report. So they will be aligned. There are two different problems. One is we just need to know who's sending something out that isn't accurate.

Dr. Evans: The other factor is if a kid is absent from school there are processes in place to notify parents of student absences on a very regular basis. So if that's breaking down we need to know that also.

Comm. Mendez: I think that there's real room for improvement in that area. I remember at the end of the school year I heard several complaints about parents receiving the information that their kid had to take summer classes at the very end of the school year

without knowing anything before and it was an ongoing situation. I've received a lot of complaints. I think that I informed some of the complaints over here, but a lot of parents didn't know that their kid had to go to summer class. In our community a lot of the parents plan their vacation and we have that problem. I know that we've received a lot of complaints. At central office there are a lot of parents complaining. So I think that there's room for improvement. I talked a couple of months before about the database that we have with the parents and the communication, but we really have to work hard on that part - effective communication with the parents. I'm going to talk from my personal experience. My son was having a little problem in one of the schools and when I received the report card I was a little concerned that I never received any suggestion on how I could help him and how he could make some improvement. That type of conversation between the teacher and the parent is not there yet. I think that we have to work hard on that.

Dr. Evans: I'm the first to say we're not there yet, but I think the place for us to start, even before this new report card is released, is a review of the reporting system already in place, which also includes STAR scores. If I remember correctly, each time they take STAR that information goes home to the parents with the next report card. It's going to the parents' home. Whether or not they're reading it is a different story, but it gets to that household. Each time that it's administered, four times a year, it's going into that household.

Comm. Irving: And at back-to-school night the curriculum committee made sure that there was a letter attached to each progress report that indicated to the parents a potential change in the grade structure and procedure. I think the intention in curriculum will be as we transition to the new report card that we'll follow that same suit. I think we said at each back-to-school night we'll always attach that letter. I'm looking at Aubrey and Maria just to make sure we're still doing that. For us the issue last year is that I don't think we did that. We never informed parents that here is the new assessment tool and a new model - reach out to your teachers, talk with your principals, and ask about this model. This year we are doing that, which I'm quite happy about.

Ms. Shafer: Also, the new report card will have the STAR assessment scores on it.

Comm. Martinez: These are all great points. We can just be mindful of correcting that as we're rolling out the new report cards.

Comm. Mendez: Dr. Evans, talking about back-to-school night, I think that we have to look at the percentage of parents that are attending. In other districts back-to-school night is mandatory. We're going to have to talk about that based on the numbers of parents that attend. I know that we have to work with our community. There are a lot of parents that have two jobs. But we have to find a way to put that conversation on the table and force parents to be there. Like I said, in other districts it is mandatory and that way they're going to be more involved and they will know the process a little better.

Comm. Irving: I don't want to walk away from this whole conversation about the personal aides. I'm not sure if the BA or the chair of finance is going to produce that report or recommendation this evening for the Board. But we did get a review in finance about the various breakdowns for what it would cost for the 34 or 32 necessary personal aides that we needed. Then we were informed in finance that that number had increased. So subsequently the question is, how do we get to that point? I would like Ms. Peron to further clarify. She said she would do it at this meeting. Exactly where are we with regards to those requests? How did we get from that 30 to 70 and back to 30?

Dr. Evans: If I can preface her remarks, we just don't arbitrarily assign personal aides or assistants to students. There is an established process that's driven by state procedures and laws in terms of the level of services that we provide students that require that an IEP committee – and our child study team is a primary vehicle here – deliberates and determines the services that each child is to get. That may or may not include a personal assistant. But once that decision is made we have to provide it. That's not negotiable.

Comm. Irving: I don't think anybody here has ever argued that. The issue is, how do we in a month go from 34 to almost 60? That process and having it explained is what we're asking for.

Dr. Evans: Okay. I know what she's going to say, but I'll let her say it.

Ms. Susana Peron: I'm going to start with the clarification of the numbers. I'm going to take you back to June of 2013 where the number for personal aides out of the special education department was 54 and out of the general education department, which comes through guidance that handles the 504 cases, was 16. So 54 and 16 is 70. That was the number in June. As we reviewed IEPs during the summer, as we went through processes of evaluating children because we do continue during the summer, the number was brought down to 32 in special education due to the fact that some of the aides were reassigned. There is a transition period from elementary to high school where some students entering high school when they sit and they're reevaluated with their families and their case managers asked not to have a personal aide because they don't want that in high school. Children were transferred and some of them went into self-contained classes where the setting is a lot smaller and the learning is specific to the classification so the personal assistant is not needed per se in those instances. In September that number was 32. Today the number in special education again is 52. In 504 it is 12. So the number is back up to 64. The point I want to make is that this number will continue to fluctuate as child study team members continue to evaluate children, as children have challenging behaviors in schools where they're transferred in and their IEP is being reviewed. The most important job of us is to keep the children that need a personal aide, the other children around, and the staff in schools safe and secure. So that personal assistant need will come through our office and we will ask for one for these types of cases. It is fluctuating as Dr. Evans said. When you're in the process of having a child in school and going through the reevaluation period, in the past the practice was to keep them on home instruction. We had children on home instruction for over 20 or 30 days while they were being reviewed and their cases were being processed. We are of the mindset to have children in schools and classrooms where they should be. I haven't done the math effectively of how much money it does cost us, but I'd rather have a child in the classroom rather than at home because bedside and home instruction does provide some instruction for them, but not like all day every day at school where they're in the classroom with their peers. So that has been a major difference. We are looking at the budget for home instruction where it was a huge budget also for the money and we're trying to reduce that as well. But the need for a personal assistant, as Dr. Evans said, is driven by the child study team. So what steps are we taking in place of having everyone aware of the services that need to happen and the cost-effectiveness? The ability to maintain and sustain such a cost is through strengthening. Several things need to happen. We need to strengthen the process for our intervention and referral services. We need to strengthen that process at schools with case managers, administrators, teachers, and guidance counselor so that they now recognize that it doesn't only take just one person next to a child to address behavior. It takes everyone in the school to address behavior and we have different mechanisms in place. One of them is a new initiative that we took on this year

called Positive Behavior Supports in Schools. That's an initiative that's coming through the NJDOE which involves a lot of training for the entire staff of a school. This first year we have 20 schools involved in that initiative. We had four schools last year begin that process. The first year's process is all training. The second year is implementation. It's on a tiered level of intervention so that there is a hierarchy of strategies and interventions that are going to be learned by school staff. There's a universal team that goes out for training. The universal team consists of teachers, administrators, vice principals, instructional assistants, and parents. Then there's specific training for child study team members so that they learn how to use tools such as a functional behavior assessment. So when they get a call that a child is being a distraction in class they go into the classroom and they use this tool to assess what is happening, what is the time of the day, what are some triggers that can be going through this child that is causing this distraction? And we're working on developing a standard operating procedure for personal assistants, which includes how we manage our personal assistants, that they don't belong to a school, and that they belong to a child. We can then recycle these certain individuals so that when the child does transfer out we don't need to hire a different person. We just need to move that person to meet the needs of another child. Is there anything else I'm leaving out?

Comm. Irving: That was great information.

Ms. Peron: I told you I'd do my homework and get the numbers for you.

Comm. Irving: The question is that number of 30. How do we get there? Is that all through IEP evaluations done between the course of September and now?

Ms. Peron: From June. We're back at 52.

Comm. Irving: I'm sorry. 20.

Ms. Peron: 20.

Comm. Irving: We were at 32 before. So would that then mean that those additional 20 have all been through IEPs that we have done over the course of the last month?

Ms. Peron: Yes, sir.

Comm. Irving: Let me ask again if that number was 32 we have not hired anyone to eat into that 32 between the time that number was given to us and now?

Ms. Peron: We have hired a few personal assistants for the students in our behavior disability classes.

Comm. Irving: So the number is probably higher than 20 then that have been classified. If you say it was 32 back in September, and I know we've hired folks at School 20, that eats into that 32.

Ms. Peron: No. That's the difference between the 54 in June and the 30. That was the 32. At the start of the year we needed 32.

Comm. Irving: Correct.

Ms. Peron: When we ended the year it was 52.

Comm. Irving: Correct. But at the start of the year we said we needed 32 folks. The question I'm asking is did we hire people that are part of that 32 cluster.

Ms. Peron: Yes, we did.

Ms. Gloria Bodker: It's yes and no because students were added between September and November 6. So it's almost like a wash because if we were able to hire 8 personal aides we still added students...

Comm. Irving: I hear you. I'm just trying to get a firm number of how many additional classifications came between the time we were quoted for that 32 and now. It's not 20. It's probably a little more than that. Again, I'm just trying to get my mind around if that's the case over the course of a month we classified almost 20-something kids and decided they need to have instructional aides or personal aides. If that's the case over the course of a month you classified over 20 children, then that concerns me.

Ms. Bodker: It may not only be initial evaluations though.

Comm. Irving: It might have been backdated from...

Ms. Bodker: It might have been that IEPs and programs were reviewed and during the course of that review it was determined that in order to keep a student in a general education setting, which is always our goal, we would need to have either a shared or personal aide.

Ms. Peron: Right. I don't want you to think that these are all new students coming in and being processed. There is a reevaluation process and there is a review of program for every student. So some students that may not have had a personal aide assigned today they do. They've reached a different program. They've reached a different grade level. They're not doing as well as they did the year before and that's why there's a process of reevaluation.

Ms. Bodker: The other thing that we need to consider is the number of students that are transferring in. On a daily basis we get at least at minimum two students that come to central registration. If they have an IEP from either another school in New Jersey or an out-of-state IEP we have to honor that for at least 30 days. Some of these students could be as a result of transfers in. There are a number of factors that contribute to this. It's not just that there are new students being evaluated.

Comm. Irving: I just have one more question. I don't want to seem like I'm nitpicking, but I'm concerned about this from a finance standpoint because the Board is being asked to entertain an idea to hire additional staff and I need to be very clear what we're being asked to even undertake. 32 financially is a pretty hard number to have to swallow. 54 or 64 are even harder. So I guess for me it would be very helpful to share with the Board a formula for how we got back to this number, whether that's students who transferred in or were evaluated. I could care less about names, but I think it helps me to understand the efficacy of the number that we've been given and how we got to that number.

Ms. Peron: The process is not here, but what we did put together was a list without names but with IDs, the program that they're in, the name of the staff, and the need. So the highlighted yellow are all the children that in program right now that need a personal assistant, but have a substitute in its place because we haven't hired that staff person. I did have that for you and I will give that to Cheryl for the Board.

Comm. Irving: And the dates that the IEPs were completed that required them to have those.

Ms. Peron: I didn't add that.

Comm. Irving: Then I'll be quite frank with you – it's a moot point. The point Comm. Kerr and I are trying to get to is we're trying to establish from whence we've come. How do we gauge the growth and trying to understand what that means for us as a district and in your department? That's the important part. I'm not going to doubt the level of work your staff has done. Our question is just trying to understand this growth and how it's happened.

Comm. Hodges: How many students grow out of their IEP, get evaluated with another IEP, or in essence are declassified? Is there a rate that we've noticed on a monthly basis or what have you? I remember there was a company that we voted for last month whose claim was that they don't just evaluate kids, they get them off classification. I'm just wondering...

Ms. Peron: What company was that?

Comm. Hodges: I remember seeing it there and I was taken aback by that. I'm just wondering...

Ms. Bodker: We can get that number for you, how many students are returned to general education. I don't have that number right now, but we can certainly provide you that.

Comm. Hodges: I think I misspoke. I think that company was down in a workshop. That was one of their claims. I'm going to bring that information to you. I remember seeing that and saying this is interesting. Based on what is happening here in this discussion I'm kind of curious what kind of rate we have in terms of returning these students or declassifying these students. I think it would be instructive to look at that. That has some bearing on what's being discussed here, but may also bring a broader concern to light.

Comm. Martinez: That's a valid point. Just to follow up on that, it was discussed in committee yesterday that the intent is not to keep these children on this. It's to eventually get them off. I just want to put that out there.

Comm. Irving: The concern I have to that point is if we hire these folks we take on additional staff and we may not necessarily need them for the longevity of that child's career. Far be it from us to hire folks and then in about four or five years say, "We really don't need you. Find a new job." There has to be a much better way. I don't want anybody here to think I'm trying to be facetious with my request. It's sincere. I'm just trying to grapple with how that happened over the course of a month and a half.

Ms. Peron: Your questions are valid. I think you have to understand the process and you have to see all of the different things that we go through and you haven't seen that.

Comm. Cleaves: Also with the spike in number of the children that are being classified, are they newcomers to the district or kindergartens just starting school? The level may make it easier for Comm. Irving to understand how we went from seemingly being on

target to now we're blowing ourselves out of the water again. I'm not sure if your spreadsheet has it broken down like that.

Ms. Peron: By grade level.

Comm. Cleaves: We should see higher numbers in the lower grades as opposed to higher grades because higher grades we should have caught by now. We should have.

Ms. Bodker: The numbers of students that are referred actually increases as the students go into the higher grades.

Ms. Peron: Especially after third grade when the shift is that you have to read to learn.

Comm. Cleaves: The numbers are higher for higher grades than they are for lower grades?

Dr. Evans: Yes.

Ms. Peron: The middle grades.

Dr. Evans: The single largest area of disability, other than speech, which is a related service or primary service depending on the kid, is learning disabilities. That's not typically identified until about third grade.

Ms. Peron: That's correct.

Dr. Evans: That's where the bubble is.

Comm. Martinez: Furthermore, do we have a breakdown of just what he was alluding to, for the IEPs what are they being classified for?

Ms. Peron: We have that. It's not on this spreadsheet but we have that.

Comm. Martinez: So maybe we can include that information on a spreadsheet so we can get a larger view.

Dr. Evans: If I can make a suggestion, this is bigger than you all can imagine and the nuances you will probably never understand. But what you might understand are the processes and procedures that lead to a kid getting there. Even though every kid is different, all of their circumstances are different, it's not like there's a particular criteria you have to meet that applies to every kid as you're making a decision regarding their placement and the services they get. Recently Ms. Bodker and Ms. Peron's staff have revised our processes and procedures. In fact, I don't know if it's still in draft form. The copy on my desk still had "draft" on it.

Ms. Peron: It was Board-approved.

Comm. Irving: Did we have a review of it?

Ms. Peron: Yes, you did.

Dr. Evans: It may be wise to make that a workshop topic and let them explain because then you'll see that the answers to your questions aren't answers that are as easy to come by as some other things. It's unpredictable. You cannot predict from one week to

the next or one day to the next how many kids we're going to have coming in, how many kids go through an IEP process and we determine that there is an IA or not. It is completely unpredictable. That's why it's an IEP, Individual Education Program. It's not cut and dry and universally applied to all kids. The process is, but when you start looking at the specifics it is very different. I'm going to ask Ms. Peron and Ms. Bodker to get with me and let's prepare something for an upcoming Board workshop and make that the topic so you can better understand what we're talking about.

Comm. Irving: I don't think that's necessary, Dr. Evans.

Comm. Hodges: It may not address your question, but I certainly would want the discussion.

Comm. Irving: I think what you're speaking of is still different than the request that myself and Comm. Kerr have because we're being asked to pay for this. So I think it behooves this Board to have a clear picture of what we're being asked to pay for. That, with all due respect, has to do with the process, but also the price tag for how we got here. So the question is how did we get to this number in the course of the last month and whether that was done through 20 evaluations, new kids who came with IEPs, reclassifications. Seeing that and being able to understand that these are the firm numbers that the district and the Board is being asked to provide services for just from an efficacy standpoint I think is really important. I think there are two separate things that we're talking about.

Comm. Hodges: But Mr. Chair, I still want that discussion. I think it's helpful.

Comm. Irving: If you want it, that's fine. We can do it. I just don't want the need to understand how we got these numbers to be underscored under a Board presentation. This is something that hopefully will be provided soon because we can't as a Board discuss and adopt any funding formula for these folks until we have these numbers.

Comm. Martinez: Points well taken. Are there any further questions?

Comm. Hodges: I can understand your original instructions, but I do have some questions regarding the actual resolutions themselves. Regarding A-1, can this be explained to me?

Ms. Peron: I don't think A-1 is mine.

Comm. Hodges: This is a reading training program of some sort.

Comm. Martinez: Yes, a reading recovery program. I'll take a shot at it and if you need further clarification... As it was explained to me, the reading recovery program is currently only taking place at School 9. Two teachers have received this training in reading recovery and they're going to in turn parlay that with the first grade student population. So it's two teachers at School 9 who are in turn using this to help first grade students at School 9.

Comm. Hodges: Didn't we train reading coaches or whatever? We had 20 of them one year and then another batch. What's the difference between what they're doing and these people who we're now paying for?

Dr. Evans: This is a program that the reading people will use to teach the kids.

Comm. Hodges: It says in here they're going to be...

Comm. Martinez: Teachers receive training in this program that they can use to service the students in the first grade at the school.

Comm. Hodges: Are our coaches that we paid and trained going through this? Are they being taught this? Or is this just the people at School 9?

Dr. Evans: As I understand it this is only at School 9.

Comm. Martinez: Correct, particular only to two teachers at School 9.

Comm. Hodges: Do they have any of those coaches over there? I'm just trying to understand why we're spending money to do this when we've trained two cohorts of teachers to do this stuff.

Dr. Cavanna: Dr. Hodges, this is an agreement that the district made with Nassau County BOCES. These two teachers received college credits and they were trained as reading recovery teachers. I think it's about an 18-credit program. As part of the agreement with Westchester County BOCES there's something called Continuing Contact. The coordinator from that organization comes to the school several times during the year and provides training and also our teachers go to other school districts with that coordinator and they continue their training. It's sort of like what lawyers and doctors do. It's continuing professional training in the reading recovery method of teaching reading to first graders. It's not entirely different from what the coaches do, but we've agreed to keep this cohort together with our two teachers and the other teachers from Northern New Jersey. They work together, meet once a month, and work together on improving their own skills.

Comm. Hodges: My real question is, what services do they provide over and above our reading coaches?

Dr. Cavanna: They provide the linkage with the university. I'm not entirely sure, but I believe the university is either Rutgers or New York University. It's one or the other. They provide the latest materials and then they do something which is very interesting which I hope Board members will get to see. They do a behind the glass training. About once a month our teachers and all the teachers in Northern New Jersey go and they sit behind the glass, a one-way mirror, and one of the teachers and one of the parents volunteer to bring their child there and they watch the teachers instructing one-on-one. Then the student leaves and the teacher comes out and they're critiqued. They get better at what they're doing. It's a professional development model which the district had bought into in the past and it has been very successful at School 9.

Comm. Hodges: That still brings me to the question about our reading coaches that we have here. What's their function? Isn't that what they're supposed to be doing?

Dr. Cavanna: This is something like the IFL where the people doing the training have to be certified. That's why we're expending this money. The people from Westchester County BOCES are certified to provide this training. We can get our coaches certified, but that would be a big deal and a big expense for the district.

Dr. Evans: You're referring to the reading specialists that we had trained at Montclair.

Comm. Hodges: Yes.

Dr. Evans: They are reading specialists, not coaches. They're out there assigned to schools performing a similar function, but there are not enough of them. There are nowhere near enough of them.

Comm. Hodges: So what you're saying is that this is in addition to...

Dr. Evans: Yes.

Comm. Hodges: And both of those teachers are located at School 9.

Dr. Cavanna: Right.

Comm. Hodges: Okay. I'm still unclear, but I'll come back to that later. On A-2, I noticed the Groove Social Fellowship.

Dr. Evans: Which item are you referring to?

Comm. Hodges: A-2. We're paying for the background checks.

Comm. Martinez: For the fingerprinting, yes.

Comm. Hodges: We have parents who want to come and volunteer. What troubles me is we're asking these people who we want to come and do this stuff to pay for their own fingerprinting. But we're going to pay for these people who I'm sure are doing a wonderful service but it's not their kids. Those parents who want to come we're insisting that they get fingerprinted. For some that's an expense which they might not want to take on because they're getting a full background check. It's not just fingerprints. It's a full background check we have to do. We've decided to do that. I don't think it's a state requirement.

Dr. Evans: This was initiated by the principal. So the principal chose to do this out of her federal dollars.

Comm. Hodges: I'm talking about parents throughout the district.

Dr. Evans: We've not decided to do that district-wide.

Comm. Hodges: Some parents are being asked to do that though.

Dr. Evans: Maybe I misunderstood what you're asking.

Comm. Hodges: Background checks in order to volunteer and work with students.

Dr. Evans: It's required that there are background checks. Unless it's a case like Lolita Vaughan who chose to pay for it herself out of her budget the district doesn't pay for it.

Comm. Hodges: I still need clarification, but I'll do that at another level. On A-6, we're paying for special education for Tech? Is that an ongoing arrangement?

Dr. Evans: Apparently this is a student for whom... The school that they're assigned to is Tech. The IEP committee obviously had to make a placement. I have the item here. Is Gloria still back there? She can give any detail that you want relating to that.

Ms. Peron: We do pay for special education tuition. The tuition for general education students also lies in our budget.

Comm. Hodges: So if a child with an IEP winds up somehow at Tech we get assessed additional fees over and above their regular tuition.

Ms. Peron: Yes. It costs more to educate because of the needs and the different staff ratios and all of that. The tuition is a little different than the general education tuition.

Comm. Hodges: Who determines what that additional cost will be?

Mr. Peron: The county.

Comm. Hodges: The county or Tech?

Mr. Peron: Passaic County Tech is a county school.

Comm. Hodges: There are two different entities though. Who in particular is giving that number? Does the county itself say there's a rate?

Mr. Peron: Yes. There is a rate.

Dr. Evans: It's the educational services commission.

Mr. Peron: Yes, and there is a rate for a special education child and a general education child.

Comm. Hodges: Okay.

Mr. Peron: There's an application process that they go through. Just like the general education students that apply for Tech, so do the special education students.

Comm. Hodges: That brings me to A-7.

Mr. Peron: That's a good point. Sometimes their child study team will ask for a personal aide for those students that we have to supply.

Comm. Hodges: This is wonderful. That brings me up to A-7.

Comm. Martinez: A-7 was pulled. It's not there.

Comm. Hodges: Still, this is a generalized question.

Dr. Evans: The Bergen County Special Services Program.

Comm. Hodges: Right. Are there no Passaic County facilities that can handle that same operation? I understand it's pulled, but this is just a general question.

Ms. Bodker: These are all schools that the IEP team, including the parent, has determined the students need a more specialized program that we cannot offer.

Mr. Peron: But his question was, were there others for Passaic County?

Ms. Bodker: They have more specialized programs, usually for students with autism and sometimes students at the middle and high school level that have highly specialized programs for students with ongoing challenging behaviors. They are therapeutic. They offer those kinds of programs even in terms of environment within the school. They have quiet rooms and rooms where students can decompress with appropriate staff. The classes are very small. So for our students that have the most challenging kinds of behaviors middle school to high school, the reason we use Bergen County or Passaic County is because the rates are significantly lower than other specialized schools.

Dr. Evans: For the record, A-7 was not pulled. A-7 through A-14 are all special education placements.

Comm. Hodges: Right. Bergen County seems to be very helpful lately at all levels, from preschool all the way up. They seem to be very accommodating for us and our resources. Thank you very much. My last question is on A-18, Gifted & Talented. I'm sure this individual, Dr. Brown, is eminently qualified. Is she coming to evaluate the class? Or is she coming to teach our teachers how to evaluate the program?

Mr. Peron: She's actually coming in to evaluate the program. Not just the class, but the entire program. She's coming in to evaluate the program.

Comm. Hodges: So who's going to teach our staff to do that work? I don't want to be sitting here two years from now saying we need to call someone back to do this evaluation again.

Mr. Peron: We evaluate our staff. We go in and we do evaluations of our teachers and our administrators. This is an outside evaluator coming in to take a look at the entire comprehensive program, the curriculum that we've written, the professional development that we do, the way we set our schedules, the resources and the materials that we use for Gifted & Talented, and the criteria that we have set for program eligibility. All of those types of things.

Dr. Evans: Dr. Hodges, I would add that while we are very capable of evaluating staff our capacity to evaluate program is low.

Comm. Hodges: My question is really to that point. How do we get our staff trained to do this evaluation? I don't want to be in the same situation two or five years down the road and being told that we can't do this again. I don't object to her being here. I just want to know how we build the internal capacity to do the same thing or at least approach this function.

Dr. Evans: We would need to bring someone in to provide that level of training to staff that have prerequisites to do it. One of the competencies is being able to do qualitative and/or quantitative research to be able to get the numbers and know what to do with those numbers. That's not a skill set that if you're taught to teach or taught to do some other things that we do you're necessarily taught quantitative and qualitative research. Unless you have a doctorate or something like that, you have to do it.

Comm. Hodges: Which she conveniently does.

Dr. Evans: Yes. We would need to bring someone in. Perhaps it's a misrepresentation to say we don't have that capacity. We have that capacity at senior levels. I can do it. I've evaluated programs and I know one or two of our other senior staff members have evaluated programs as well. But that's a full-time job. It really is. So to have in place

staff to do that job we would need to train staff below the levels I'm talking about to do it. That's doable.

Comm. Hodges: Given the number of programs, and I have no idea because we don't have a compendium yet, it would seem to me that would be a very useful expenditure to get someone trained. Why give this woman the money and she leaves with her expertise and then we're stuck in the same position?

Dr. Evans: I concur with you. I do. We've evaluated a number of our programs already. We really have. Two of Ms. Peron's programs have been evaluated and probably six or eight others. So we really need to do what you're saying.

Comm. Hodges: So how do we get that concurrence to materialize?

Dr. Evans: We make it a priority and just do it. It's not that simple, but that's what we have to do, make it a priority and then do it. It is a priority, so we'll do it.

Comm. Hodges: When are we going to do that? When are we going to establish that as a priority so that we can dedicate some funding given where we are in our financial condition? I think that kind of individual is of value here given the tremendous number of programs that we have, many of which don't seem to be evaluated from my understanding.

Dr. Evans: We'll make it a priority.

Comm. Hodges: Okay. I'll ask you again.

Dr. Evans: Ask me again.

Mr. Peron: Can I say that we have that in early childhood? We have a cadre of program evaluators. I know that this evaluation tool doesn't sit greatly with you, but through the ECERS, which is what the State of New Jersey evaluates early childhood programs on, we have gone through extensive training on becoming program evaluators. It is, as Dr. Evans said, a professional development over time. Then there are reliability measures and activities that you have to take into and classes that you have to go to. So it is a hefty price tag, but it is well worth it because we can continue then the evaluation of programs.

Comm. Hodges: You're absolutely right. It does not sit well with me.

Mr. Peron: I know that. I know you very well, Dr. Hodges.

Comm. Hodges: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Comm. Martinez: If there are any further questions, can we submit them in writing? That concludes my report.

Legal

Comm. Irving: Legal has one submission, which is B-1. Lisa, did legal meet yet? The legal committee has not met yet, but for discussion at the Board meeting there's the approval of the lease for 90 Delaware Avenue. Are there any questions or discussion on that?

Ms. Pollak: It's about a lease, so Mr. Sapara-Grant can also respond.

Comm. Hodges: I know that we've seen some alleged flexibility on the part of the SDA. Is it possible to revisit the purchase of this building? I know we're going to have to be here for a while. It makes no sense to me to just be paying rent for it when we can actually own the building. I just think that it's a better use of the taxpayers' money that we can somehow dedicate these funds to the purchase of the building.

Dr. Evans: We can have that conversation with the SDA. Keep in mind we're talking about something that even if the SDA agrees, and I don't know that they will, the landlord may not want to sell it and we can't force him to sell it.

Comm. Hodges: I think originally there was a willingness to sell. We came in with that understanding.

Mr. Chris Sapara-Grant: Good evening. The state would normally not pay for administrative offices. In the past what had happened was that school districts would provide an early childhood element in the building that would trigger the state paying for the building, including administrative offices. That practice has ceased. So we had those discussions with them and that is why we had at a certain time saved a portion of the second floor that we wanted to convert into early childhood facilities. When we broached the issue they indicated that the state no longer supports that element. On the other hand, I know before I took this position there were discussions about possibly purchasing the building, but as far as I know we have a long-term lease. I am not sure currently the landlord is interested in selling the building. He had approached us in an attempt to even extend further the lease. I think there's always the right price for anything so we can still have that conversation.

Comm. Irving: We pay for the rent for this building through our operating budget, our capital budget. The money for this building comes from where? It's not SDA money is it?

Mr. Sapara-Grant: It's not SDA money. It's from our operating budget.

Comm. Irving: Right. I'm just trying to understand how the SDA even falls into the equation if we wanted to do a lease/purchase arrangement for the space.

Mr. Sapara-Grant: I don't believe the SDA actually factors into it.

Comm. Irving: Right.

Mr. Sapara-Grant: The Department of Education would or may not approve and then because the SDA is the funding mechanism for schools if we had a school facility and it was approved for funding through their charter then they would support it. So right now even if they had the funds they would rather pursue the funds for full-fledged schools.

Comm. Irving: The point I'm trying to make is that the conversation really needs to be had with the landlord. If he's potentially interested in selling this space, then I think it opens us up to a much broader question of how do we go about it. I don't know whether that may be you or legal, but I think it's worth floating. I think it's worth a formal letter that the Board is copied on that says we'd like to discuss the terms of our lease and gauge their interest in potentially selling the property. It doesn't hurt just to ask.

Comm. Hodges: What's the approximate cost per year?

Mr. Sapara-Grant: I'm not very sure right now. I'd be able to provide that information to you later on.

Comm. Hodges: Because the original asking price was something in the order of \$14 million for this building. How long have we been here? It was \$14 million that they wanted for this building.

Mr. Sapara-Grant: Mr. President, if you don't mind, with the Superintendent's permission, I can approach the landlord who I'm quite comfortable with and just get a feel on where his mind is.

Comm. Hodges: Do we pay his taxes?

Comm. Kerr: Yes, it's a triple net lease.

Comm. Mendez: I think that when we're getting into a lease agreement there's an option to buy. I think we have to look into that because I have experience and I've helped some friends in this area. When you get into an agreement you can just sign the lease with the option to buy the building at the end of the lease agreement. That's very doable on a commercial area. I don't know if at this level this is possible, but I've seen this before and I think this is a great investment. Even if we're renewing the lease and if he's not agreeing to sell the building right away we could sign the lease with the condition that at the end of the lease he has to sell the building at the market price. On commercial leases I've seen that before. I don't know if we can think about that.

Comm. Kerr: Was that clause part of the original contract?

Mr. Sapara-Grant: I don't recall seeing it and the lease is not being renewed until 2025.

Dr. Evans: Correct.

Mr. Sapara-Grant: I think it was 30 years.

Comm. Irving: Mr. Sapara-Grant, if you can report that to the facilities committee I think that would be great. It just doesn't hurt to ask.

Fiscal

Comm. Kerr: The fiscal committee met on October 31. Members present were Comm. Irving, Comm. Hodges, and myself. Member absent was Comm. Teague. From the staff we had Mr. Richard Kilpatrick, Business Administrator, Ms. Daisy Ayala, Assistant BA, Ms. Sonia Figueroa, Director of Transportation, and Ms. Michelle Glisson. Our meeting started at approximately 7:10 p.m. In keeping with the committee's goal to learn more about the operational side of the departments that are fiscally overlaid we invited Ms. Sonia Figueroa, head of the transportation department, to come and give us an overview of her operation. In her presentation she outlined the difficulty her department was experiencing in meeting critical deadlines to secure bus routes due to lateness of information getting back to her office. The resulting problem from this is that by not having all the requisite information all the time sometimes the best possible decisions are not made which has a potential of opening up the district to the likelihood of higher costs for transportation services. She said February starts the transportation review process for each year and if all the pertinent information is given to her department based on the established schedule they would be better able to eliminate

most or all of the problems experienced at the beginning of the school year. I asked about the transportation budget and why the district is spending so much money on transportation happening outside the district. Ms. Figueroa said based on the McKinney-Vento Law the district is responsible to provide transportation to all students who are qualified for it, including those who are categorized as homeless and living outside of city limits. Answering the question of the size of the transportation budget she said it stands presently at around \$16 million a year. On the subject of alleged improper practices by contractors who skirt the agreement with the district by co-mingling students and understaffing routes by reducing monitors to save costs, Ms. Figueroa said that this is all in the past and there's no evidence of that happening now due to a rigorous system of spot-checking they have in place to ensure the fidelity of all contracts executed to the fullest extent of the agreement. Mr. Kilpatrick gave us a timeline of the budget calendar in which he made the point that the expectation is not to take the budget document a week before the meeting, look at it, and then vote without a full examination and understanding of the document. Critical dates in its development should be observed and followed as we move into the budget adoption phase. Again, we had a vigorous discussion on the district's PD training, its application, and are we measuring its impact at the classroom level. From our discussion concerns were expressed that there is still nothing in place to adequately measure the true impact of this tool given the size of our expenditure in this area. It was our conclusion that the true value of the training to the district given our fiscal reality. It was also pointed out that we cannot continue in this same vein as we have done in the case of reading specialists. I was happy to hear the discussion this evening about reading specialists where we train cohorts of teachers for jobs and fail to use them for the specific purpose for which they were trained. How to address the impending fiscal cliff was briefly discussed and in so doing we identified a few areas which we believe must be seriously looked at to prevent the inevitable if we fail to act. Some of these areas mentioned were charter schools. The reason we mentioned charter schools is that the imposition of charters in the district is seriously taking away resources from the district. So we believe that there needs to be some kind of representation made to the Department of Education to let them know that maybe our district has had its quota of charters. Transportation is another area that we think we need to look into. We also identified individual school budgets, primarily staffing, facilities, and health benefit costs. These are some of the things that we believe need to be examined, looked at, and assessed. December 14 was decided as a day for both the fiscal committee and the business administrator and his team to sit down and start serious substantive discussions on a way forward regarding our finances. We have talked about personal assistants and this was discussed in our meeting. This tells me that there is some seriousness around the whole issue of personal assistants. The matter of how many personal assistants in the district needs to be filled and the existing requirement was also discussed. At our meeting prior to Monday's meeting we were given a number of 34 and that was said again tonight, but I'm just rehashing this because it was discussed in our meeting. At our meeting we were given a number of 34 which we were told was arrived at – and this is significant – after a comprehensive review of every child's IEP in this district. That's what we were told. Ms. Gloria Bodker is here so she can rebut this if that's not what we were told then. So there was a review of all the IEPs in the district. The number presented to us at our last meeting was somewhere about 60. As Comm. Martinez has said, this is an increase of about 100%. Some attempts were made tonight to clear the air regarding it, but I don't believe all the facts were laid out quite clearly, at least not to my satisfaction regarding this issue. So based on the figure presented by the BA, which was 34, and the numbers he gave us would run us into millions of dollars. If you multiply that by two we are looking at something like \$4 million to address that little piece of the problem. It is a very significant amount of money that we are looking at. So it is our recommendation that there should be further analysis of the situation before

any real significant action is taken in an overall sense. Ms. Daisy Ayala reported on a trip to Utah to attend the ALIO conference. She said the conference was primarily built around program announcements for the system. From questions posed to her about the system she noted that it was reported that 26 districts have been having some difficulty navigating the software. Even here in our district the implementation phase is still a struggle. However, she went on to let us know that the system is more comprehensive in terms of data generation than the system we had prior with Edumet. So in terms of its capacity to give us what we need it's greater than Edumet. After that we looked at the bills list and we reviewed them. All of our questions and queries were adequately answered by the business administrator. Our adjournment was taken at approximately 9:45.

Comm. Irving: I did have one question for the Superintendent or the Deputy and it had to do with Ms. Figueroa's presentation, which was very in-depth. I think she gave the committee members some great information and our conversation was to have her present to the Board about the changes that transportation has done, the challenges, and how she plans to work through those. We had addressed the fact that when Daisy Ayala was the acting BA, after the unfortunate incident that occurred with the young lady who fell out of the bus last year she had put together a committee. I think Eileen took part in that or helped to craft that. Then Daisy put together an amazing corrective action plan that pretty much has been implemented by transportation, with the exception of the fact that the plan called for hiring additional staff members in transportation to do spot-checks on the buses. When we asked if that was being done the very candid response was it's being done, but not frequently. Then I further followed up and said where is the person that we're supposed to get in that corrective action? I don't believe much has been done when it comes to those spot-checks. My question is what's the use in going through that corrective action if we're not going to either fund that role or utilize resources in our district to be able to find that capacity to do those evaluations? We owe it to that young girl's family to follow through on what we said we were going to do. I've seen Ms. White four times in town and she's asked me four times are we going to make the changes we said we'd do. Four times I can tell her we're making them, but I'm just not comfortable with that. I want to make it very clear that we need a resolution to that point soon for how these checks will be conducted, especially given Ms. Figueroa's staff of four people who are all working full-time. How somebody is expected during the course of their day to go out and do this without the additional staff members that I thought were put inside the corrective action to make, I don't know. So we owe it to this young lady and to her family to do right by what we said we were going to do and we're not doing right by it.

Comm. Hodges: Did we issue any kind of response or in any way have any communication with our insurance company stating what we plan to do to address this issue?

Dr. Evans: I'm not aware of any.

Comm. Hodges: If we made some assertions that we are going to do x, y, and z, it would be troubling if we did not, particularly on the part of the insurance company.

Ms. Pollak: The answer is no.

Comm. Hodges: So all we have is we've issued some statement which the public or at least this mother is expecting us to make good on. It is a concern if we're not going to do that, particularly if something should happen again.

Dr. Evans: It is my understanding that our commitment was to do spot-checks. I don't remember that we said we would hire a person to do spot-checks, but we assured that spot-checks would be done.

Comm. Hodges: Was there a frequency that we suggested was going to take place, or just sport-checks?

Comm. Irving: Who do we expect to do them?

Comm. Mendez: I have a question in terms of spot-checks. Are we covering the verification of the type of insurance that the company that's getting into a contract with us has?

Dr. Evans: That's a question I would defer to Mr. Kilpatrick.

Comm. Mendez: The reason I'm going to ask is because we have to be very clear on the type of insurance. The way the economy is if one of those companies doesn't have the proper insurance it will be a huge problem for us if they get into any type of incident. We'll be fully liable for any incidents.

Mr. Richard Kilpatrick: The question is, are we requiring insurance on our contractors?

Comm. Mendez: Are we going over the documentation?

Mr. Kilpatrick: That is part of the bid process that we include that and it is reviewed in the bid that they have it. Insurance certificates are required to be processed.

Comm. Mendez: I'm not talking about in the bid. When they bid I'm very sure that they will have all the documents. I'm talking about on those spot-checks. Are we going over the insurance to make sure that they are on point with the insurance that they're supposed to have?

Mr. Kilpatrick: That is part to the checklist that we have asked to be implemented for those spot-check reviews.

Comm. Mendez: I think that's one of the most important parts in terms of knowing that we are going to have a reliable company. The second comment I want to make is that I know we're spending an extensive amount of money in transportation and I do believe that the reason why we're doing that is because of the challenges that we have with our facilities. I think that now more than ever we're transporting students from one side of the city to another side and from one school to another school in the morning. It's really tough what we're facing now in terms of facilities. This year I know that we have an increase at the elementary level and just by seeing how many students we transport from one school to another because we don't have room or because that building is over capacity I know that we're spending most of the money there. I just wanted to make that comment.

Comm. Irving: I bring this up because I take it personally because I've seen her mom and she's asked me these questions. We just have a really bad history especially in corrective actions or when we budget for positions saying we're going to fund positions and then we don't or we don't live up to it. So I'm just making it very clear. I just want to make sure we get a resolution for how this is going to happen. If it's not going to come from Ms. Figueroa's department maybe it comes from security or an outside firm. I don't care how it happens, but there needs to be regular documented spot-checks of

these buses and what we're doing. Case in point, we built guard booths outside Eastside and Kennedy and we have no guards. That was in the security plan that you, Eileen, put together. So here we are with a security plan that the Board adopts, took time for, and after the incident that took place in Connecticut the Board commissioned that we sign up for, and we have facilities to build booths and we have nobody in the booths. I pulled into Eastside the other day and it seems like I'm watching Dr. Who. It's just empty booths that are there. We have to get real or at least firm in saying what we can do. If we can't hire someone to do spot-checks, what can we do? How many guard booths are up there, Captain Smith?

Capt. James Smith: 10, five at Eastside and five at Kennedy.

Comm. Irving: So if we can't get 10 officers, can we make it happen with six?

Dr. Evans: We can get 10 officers. We can reassign them from this building for those guard booths. The officers are out there.

Capt. Smith: We wouldn't have anybody in the building though.

Dr. Evans: That's okay. Many district offices don't have guards.

Comm. Hodges: The gritty answer to the question about spot-checks is simply to ask the district to give you a report quarterly or whatever it is on the number. They'll come up with some manner. We can't dictate to them how they do it, but we can just request that a report be provided to us.

Dr. Evans: There's no question that it has to be done. I'm not suggesting that. If you ask me how many have been done so far I couldn't tell you. I would need to get with the staff and find out, but we did make that commitment. You're right.

Comm. Hodges: So just submit that report on a quarterly basis.

Comm. Kerr: From Ms. Figueroa's presentation she made it clear, as reflected in the minutes, that spot-checks are being done. So I'm not going to question whether or not. I'm just going to take her word for it. Now, I think where the Board is going is that they are being done and we just need a report. That's where we are.

Dr. Evans: We'll get you a report. That's a legitimate request.

Comm. Kerr: A report as to how many and what are the findings from those.

Comm. Hodges: Quarterly.

Comm. Kerr: Okay.

Comm. Guzman: I just want to follow up with what President Irving said regarding the guards at Eastside. I think that if we have the guard houses it really serves no purpose unless we're going to have a robot there that's going to be working. If we need the people do we have the funds that we would need to hire? I'm going to disagree a little with Dr. Evans when you said you could move the guards from here.

Dr. Evans: I said some.

Comm. Guzman: You can get some, but we have to be very careful. I'm only saying this because I was on my phone just a little while ago and there was a shooting in Detroit today that killed five people and three injured.

Comm. Hodges: Where?

Comm. Guzman: In Detroit. This was just like now. So what I'm saying is that we never know when anything is going to happen. We have a lot of parents that get upset certain times. We're vulnerable for anything to happen. But I think that if we need the people we need to get them there. Specifically at Eastside and Kennedy we need to get them there and we need to make it happen. That needs to be done.

Dr. Evans: I just need to remind everyone that in the very near future we have to face some fiscal realities. Each time we say we're going to do something, let's throw a person at it. We have to stop doing that. We have to ask who can we take from here and move over there. That's why I made the comment about this building. That's the thinking that we have to lend to the major fiscal challenge that lie before us. We have 5,000 people who work for this school system. We ought to be able to find 10 people in the district to put at Eastside in those guard booths.

Comm. Mendez: Let me just keep the momentum about Eastside and the guard booths. I really agree with Dr. Evans' point. We have some security on the second and third floor that I don't think we really need so many people in the building. I do not think that we need it. We need those people outside and we have to continue the progress that we have made with Eastside High School. The community comments how Eastside is changing and we need that to happen. We have to make sure that happens. Now you can see that it is different. We have to make sure that we have those people. We have to have those people in the guard booths. With spot-checks, what are the steps that we're going over with the drivers and the bus companies? What is the process? When we hire a company, do we know when the insurance policy expires? I think that's something very important that in transportation we need to know. When we hire a company we need to know the type of insurance that they have and when that policy expires. That's one of the most important things that we have to be on top of and I would like to know if we're getting that.

Comm. Irving: The comment Dr. Evans made is spot-on for where I was heading to. I think the guard booths need to be manned. We paid for them. But we have to figure out some type of model, whether that's picking up four. How many can we afford? Then we have to get creative for what we can and can't do, but I think that proposal needs to come to the Board relatively soon. Each day we don't have the staffing for it is each day we put our kids at risk or we put ourselves at some potential risk. I don't know, Ms. Shafer, if we can get together some type of report that maybe has a hybrid model working with finance that talks about funding five and finding another five or funding six and finding four. Do I believe given the conversation we had about special education that we can afford 10 guards? I'm telling you I don't think that's realistic. But we have to commit to making sure our kids stay safe. The Board needs to see that. I was just disappointed and frustrated when I drove into Eastside and saw these guards booths not manned. Capt. Smith, I just wondered what's the use in building these things if we're not going to have the appropriate staff members in them.

Capt. Smith: In answer to your question, one thing we do every year – and the Superintendent, Deputy, and everybody is involved in here – I'm a very good steward of public funds. I look at where we put at each school and what we need. As far as taking people from different schools, I have no problem doing that, but you're going to have to

deal with the repercussions of it. If I have three persons at one school, I'm at the bare bones at every school that we have right now. We've been cutting for the last four or five years. We've been eliminating. We had 22 police and now we have 12. We had 'x' amount of guards and now we have less. So the point is at the end of the day you reach a point where you become bare bones. It's easy to say we can take 10 people from here. We can say the same thing about teachers. We can take 10 teachers from here. We have 5,000 employees. The bottom line is at the end of the day the state and everybody else looks to our district as a best practice district. They look at us and they ask us for our recommendations throughout the whole state. They look at how we put officers and guards, how we do hybrids, how we use subcontractors, and how we use district security officers. I feel I'm pretty good at that. That's what I feel I'm pretty good at. The question was raised before about do we have five and five. We do. Can we get a little creative? Yes, but we just can't keep doing nothing. You can't keep saying to me, "Jim, let's take all 10." If you give me four or six positions, I can work some creativity on it. But we can't complain later on when some school I have to take it away from complains about it. We're at a bare minimum at a lot of these schools. A lot of the schools are troubled areas, whether it be School 10. We have to put extra people there just like they do with personal assistants. I'm familiar with that. I have an autistic child. I understand how they work with the personal aides. I immerse myself in it. I'm intimately familiar with it. It's not just a personal aide to assist in educational problems. It's a personal assistant to assist in behavioral problems which are really coming out. Take a look at School 2 right now. The woman there that had the incident with the bus wanted a personal assistant. She got a temporary personal assistant. So the bottom line is, as Dr. Evans alluded to before, on a daily basis we run into problems. Look at School 10. We had the problem over there. Each day we run into a problem and we deal with it. So what I'm trying to say is it's easy to make a statement that we can do this and we can do that, but I have no problem sitting down, going school by school, position by position, and going through it. I invite any department to do that. I welcome that discussion. I want you to understand that we are good stewards. Every year I turn money in. If we have something that we don't need, I turn the money into the business office. I turn it in and I say we were able to save money in this particular area. That's why last year I turned back \$200,000. At the end of the day I sit down there and I evaluate it. I go through what provides the most protection for not only our students, but for our staff. I welcome that discussion.

Comm. Hodges: First of all, I'm shocked to hear that the state is relying on us in the area of operations given how clearly unqualified we are to provide information. I'm stunned. In fact, I'm forced to question your statement, sir. I think the Board has the right to ask for whatever it wants, but it's the responsibility of the Superintendent to say what they can and cannot provide. So we can say that we want to see these things happen and it is incumbent upon you and the Superintendent to say you need to make some choices about what we're going to do or this is the financial situation. It's not an inappropriate question to ask or consideration, but we can't tell them what they have to do to respond to what our requests are. But it is not inappropriate to ask for it. I want to make that very clear.

Comm. Irving: I just want to make it very clear that the request is for us to figure out how we're going to do this with the Board guards. That's my thing. Ms. Shafer and Captain Smith, just figure out the formula for how you're going to do it and let's do it soon. We just had an incident happen at Garden State Plaza literacy five miles from where we live, guys. I would have never thought that would ever happen at Garden State Plaza. So we just don't know. I don't want to play Monday night quarterback and say we should have had somebody there. So let's just figure it out however it is.

Dr. Evans: We'll figure it out.

Comm. Mendez: I get very passionate in terms of safety and I think that safety has to be one of the highest priorities, especially here in Paterson. We're facing a lot of problems in our streets. When I visit a school and open the door and I see that the door is open and it's very accessible for anybody to get in, it concerns me. I think that we have to look deep into that. We have to cover all those corners and I think that we're moving forward with the safety plan that we have in place. But we have to put resources into that. It has to be a high priority. We have to make sure that we cover all those corners.

Comm. Teague: Just to piggyback off what everyone else has said, in some cases having a security officer in those booths will provide a sense of safety and stability when students and staff come in. Sometimes just the mindset of seeing an officer in those booths will let people know that the place is secure, regardless of what the situation may be. I'm not sure if there were security officers around the other night at the Garden State Plaza, but when I was there we were always on patrol because it at least gave people a sense. There are thousands of people coming into the mall and there are probably only 20 of us, but when people saw us around it would give them the sense that at least somebody is walking around or there is some sense of security or stability there. So I agree that we need to move expeditiously with putting the security guards at the booths at these high schools, even if it's just to create the awareness so that people will see them there. That's all I have to say about that.

Comm. Kerr: That concludes my report.

Facilities

Comm. Mendez: The facilities committee met yesterday. Member of the Board present was myself. Member of the staff present was Mr. Sapara-Grant. We had an extensive discussion about the long range facilities plan. At the next workshop we're going to kick off with a presentation that covers all the aspects of the long range facilities plan. We cannot start until January, but we're going to start collecting information getting into contract to be ready. I think that presentation will be very important because it will cover all the aspects and we will have a chance to make our comments and our recommendations on that. I also want to take a moment to thank Capt. Smith because we've had issues with School 25 for a very long time. I called him last week after school around 7:00 because we had a meeting with the Sixth Ward Neighborhood Association. He was there. He came with me and the Chief of Police of the City of Paterson came. We have the "No Trespassing" sign finally on and we're moving forward. The community is very pleased and happy with that meeting. I want to thank you for that. Also, last week there was a problem with the heating system at Don Bosco and we're also addressing that problem. I will have my full report for the regular meeting. We have D-1. Are there any questions?

Policy

Comm. Irving: I'm going to read Comm. Simmons' report. The policy committee is scheduled to meet on Monday, November 18 at 5:00 p.m. They are awaiting new policies and regulations from the policy consultant Strauss Esmay that are developed in conjunction with Achieve New Jersey administrative code centered on the new evaluation requirements. They were received earlier this week, but I don't believe they're reflected in the policy report presently. We received one resolution for our workshop meeting and one for our regular meeting. The resolution for tonight was for

first reading on a policy we adopted last month, but required a word change on page four of that policy. The word "student" was changed to the word "parent." That is the submission of Comm. Simmons' report this evening. For the Board meeting in two weeks he'll have E-1 as an item for discussion. Are there any questions for Policy E-1?

Items Requiring Review and Comments

Personnel

Comm. Cleaves: I want to just commend the Commissioners tonight because we all were in that same training and we all came tonight with the same mindset of how we were going to approach our committee meetings. I want to commend all of you for doing that. Personnel did meet on Monday. The start time was 5:15. In attendance were myself and Comm. Martinez. Staff present was Jaime Murphy. We present F-1. We too did discuss in the personnel meeting the DPR in personnel that we did not get the full 100% credit for in February. It had to do with the certificated staff report for our teachers. That process has now been remedied and we expect to get our full 100% credit in personnel for that indicator. The meeting concluded at 6:15. That ends my report.

Comm. Hodges: You mentioned mentoring, which I think was another one of those concerns that was raised about teachers receiving mentoring.

Comm. Cleaves: It was in the packet. We reviewed but we didn't go into detail into it. It was in the packet that was submitted to us. It has a section in there under mentoring.

Comm. Hodges: The question I'm raising is simply, are we ensuring that the new teachers have the appropriate mentoring in place so that won't be another area that we get caught in? That's one of the indicators.

Dr. Evans: It is. It's a part of the process of what we need to do. To fully answer your question we need to survey principals to make sure obviously that new teachers have mentors. I couldn't tell you whether or not they all have it today, but we've communicated that to principals. We need to find out if it's done.

Comm. Hodges: We have eight days. That's an area that I remember there being some issues around. That's why I'm raising it now. I'm hoping that gets addressed within the next week or so.

OTHER BUSINESS

Comm. Irving: Is there any Other Business to discuss?

Comm. Hodges: We are required to bring back information from the workshop. I think we have to create a mechanism to do that. I know on the form that I handed back I listed the Board and some other people I was going to bring information to. We need a mechanism in which to get that done. I've already supplied some of the information to the staff. I have more from vendors and things, but the purpose of the workshop, obviously, is to glean some training and then bring it back for whomever. I certainly saw that we were exposed to some things and I think I'd love to share with the Board, at least in part. I have other documents I intend to share with the staff.

Comm. Cleaves: I have t-shirts for you guys too that I got when I was at the Board conference. I have a t-shirt for Comm. Martinez, Comm. Irving, Comm. Simmons, and Comm. Hodges. I think everyone else I gave them theirs.

Comm. Hodges: But that mechanism is important because I don't want us to get caught.

Comm. Irving: I'm going to work with Cheryl and let's identify a meeting and some time for us to kind of share some of the best practices as colleagues that we heard from the conference. I'll just listen or share stories about my trip to Puerto Rico.

Comm. Teague: Just briefly, beginning Friday we're going to be stationed on the corner of Main and Grand Streets giving out hot coffee and cocoa to the homeless people that are in that area.

Comm. Irving: Who is "we"?

Comm. Teague: Myself, my family, my aunts and uncles and so forth. We're going to set up a table. So if anyone wants to donate boxes of hot chocolate or Styrofoam cups, spoons, or anything like that it's well-appreciated.

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

The meeting was adjourned at 8:50 p.m.