

## **WATERBURY BOARD OF EDUCATION**

### *MINUTES ~ RESCHEDULED REGULAR MEETING*

Wednesday, February 6, 2013 at 6:30 p.m.

Waterbury Arts Magnet School, 16 South Elm Street, Waterbury, Connecticut

**PRESENT:** President Stango, Commissioners Brown, D'Amelio, Harvey, Hayes, Morales, Rodriguez, Sweeney, and Van Stone.

**ABSENT:** Commissioner Harkins.

**ALSO PRESENT:** Superintendent Kathleen Ouellette, Chief Academic Officer Anne Marie Cullinan, Special Advisor to Superintendent Paul Sequeira, Chief Operating Officer & Chief of Staff Paul Guidone, Director of Personnel Ron Frost, Attorney Maurice Mosley, and Education Liaison Mary Ann Marold.

#### **1. SILENT PRAYER**

President Stango called the meeting to order at 6:47 p.m. with a moment of silence.

STANGO: In our prayer this evening I ask that you remember the passing of Michael "Bibber" Goggin. Mr. Goggin was a teacher in Waterbury for over 33 years. He taught at Walsh, Kennedy, and Wilby High School where he was the Business Department Chairman. Mr. Goggin was also a Veteran of the United States Army and he also served the City as the Summer Recreation Director at various parks and recreational centers. We remember him and his family in our prayer tonight.

#### **2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE TO THE FLAG**

Dr. Ouellette led everyone in the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag.

#### **3. ROLL CALL**

CLERK: Commissioner Brown.

BROWN: Present.

CLERK: Commissioner D'Amelio.

D'AMELIO: Here.

CLERK: Commissioner Harkins (absent). Vice President Harvey.

HARVEY: Here.

CLERK: Commissioner Hayes.

HAYES: Present.

CLERK: Commissioner Morales.

MORALES: Here.

CLERK: Commissioner Rodriguez.

RODRIGUEZ: Here.

CLERK: Commissioner Sweeney.

SWEENEY: Here.

CLERK: Commissioner Van Stone.

VAN STONE: Present.

CLERK: President Stango.

STANGO: Present. Just for the record, Commissioner Harkins was here earlier, he had to return to a previously arranged engagement that he had.

#### **4. COMMUNICATIONS**

**Upon a motion by Commissioner Sweeney and duly seconded by Commissioner Hayes, it was voted unanimously to receive and place on file the following communications:**

1. Copy of communication dated December 26, 2012 from Blum Shapiro regarding the City's audit for year ending June 30, 2012.
2. Email communication received January 21, 2013 from Walsh School Governance Council regarding public hearing for reconstitution recommendation for Walsh School.
3. Copy of email communication received January 22, 2013 from Paul Guidone to Walsh School Governance Council regarding request for reconstitution of Walsh School.
4. Copy of communication dated January 25, 2013 from Civil Service certifying Sheila Ritucci for the position of Paraprofessional.
5. Copy of communication dated January 28, 2013 from Civil Service certifying Kelly Martoni for the position of ABA Behavioral Therapist.
6. Copy of communication from Arthur Paulone to the Editor received January 28, 2013 regarding building a new school.
7. Demand for Arbitration received January 31, 2013 from Waterbury Teachers' Association regarding grievance 12-13-05.
8. Demand for Arbitration received January 31, 2013 from Waterbury Teachers' Association regarding grievance 12-13-06.
9. Copy of communication dated January 31, 2013 from Civil Service certifying Aina Winston for the position of Paraprofessional.

STANGO: Motion is made and seconded. Any discussion? All in favor, opposed, motion carries.

#### **5. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**Upon a motion by Commissioner Sweeney and duly seconded by Commissioner Harvey, it was voted unanimously to approve the minutes of the Special Meeting of November 29, 2012, Committee Meeting of November 29, 2012, Regular Meeting**

**of December 6, 2012, Special Meeting of December 13, 2012, Committee Meeting of December 13, 2012, Regular Meeting of December 20, 2012, Committee Meeting of January 10, 2013, and Regular Meeting of January 17, 2013.**

STANGO: Motion has been made and seconded. Any discussion? All in favor, opposed, motion carries.

## **6. WENDELL CROSS RECOGNITION**

SUPERINTENDENT: Thank you Mr. President. Mr. Amato and staff, could you please approach the Board. My hardest congratulations to all members of the Wendell Cross School learning community. Your selection as a school of distinction by the Connecticut Department of Education is a tribute to the school's instructional initiatives and its high expectations for all students as well as the statewide recognition of the school's highly professional faculty and staff. This achievement is certainly a cause for celebration for our school district and we're so very proud of you. And it is an example of bringing to life our mission of success for all students. Wendell Cross has been specifically recognized for making the highest progress among schools within Connecticut with a school performance index of less than 88. Wendell Cross School is among the top ten percent of schools making gains in this area. In honoring schools within this category, Commissioner Pryor stated he wanted to recognize progress and distinction and not just focus on the need for intervention and support. This award belongs to the entire Wendell Cross school community as a result of visionary leadership, skillful execution of curricula, collaboration between and among administration, faculty and staff, parents, students, and members of the community. It is a tangible proof that it takes a community working together to accomplish positive outcomes. Please accept my sincere congratulations for this achievement. I'm well aware of the dedication and selfless devotion of all the members of the school community that brought this deserving recognition to the school and the district. It is especially important to me that every student at Wendell Cross is commended on this success. I feel confident that this is just the beginning of many awards for Wendell Cross and distinctions that lie ahead in the future for that school. My sincere congratulations and I understand, Mr. Amato, you've been invited to the State Department with the Commissioner for a Legislative Breakfast as well. So congratulations and we do have a certificate for you.

*(applause)*

STANGO: I'm very pleased also that Dr. Sequeira has joined the group. I have a certificate for the school and staff.

*(applause)*

## **7. PUBLIC ADDRESSES THE BOARD**

**Upon a motion by Commissioner Hayes and duly seconded by Commissioner Sweeney, it was voted unanimously to suspend the regular order of business to allow the public to address the Board at 6:57 p.m.**

STANGO: Motion made and seconded. All speakers are encouraged to submit prepared written statements to the Commissioners. Comments shall be limited to a

maximum of three minutes. There will be no responses this evening to any questions or concerns raised; they will be referred to the Administration for review and response.

**Bettejane Wesson, 79 Crescent Street, had the following comments:** I'm here to share my dismay about the School Board proposal to take land away from Hamilton Park for the purpose of building a school. Any city board making a land-grab on City parks sets a dangerous precedent. The land was a gift in trust to Waterbury from Mr. Goss and should be honored. Future donations to Waterbury will be discouraged if it is seen that the City does not honor them. The land Mr. Guidone proposes to take is included in Hamilton Park's description on a national register of historical places. Reduction of the acres listed in these documents will likely result in a loss of registration. Registration is important because it allows the City to apply for grants for future Hamilton Park renovations. I am against taking part of Hamilton, or any City park, for this or for any other purpose, ever. This is a bad time to suggest building yet another school, we have a climate of economic downturn in Waterbury, our grand list has diminished, reevaluation will demand a higher mill rate to break even. I am not saying not ever to new schools, I am simply saying not now. Mr. Guidone's remark in today's news that the people should put aside the ability to pay and vote "yes" on the budget seems irresponsible. We cannot bank on state and federal bailouts. Education and children are two buzz words that make people nod "yes" but new school buildings are only part of the educational process. Waterbury can build schools that are Taj Mahals and staff them with Rhodes scholars yet there's a large problem in this city that still will not have been addressed; the problem in discipline. Fights in schools are regular news. Recently I read about a day for the Kennedy High Principal. It sounded more like reform school than a place of education. At State Street School cursing, bullying, and threatening are daily events. Last week some Wilby High School students ganged up on a fellow student on Hill Street and beat him so hard that his brain shifted. Fifth grade girls at Bunker Hill Elementary are hurting each other. In every school teachers are in danger as well. This could not continue. How could we say to folks "move to Waterbury, we have great schools" when parents fear for the safety of their children at some schools during the regular school day. The plan to hire a Behavior Technician for students is a step but it does sound more administrative than hands-on. I wondered had you considered asking the highly effective PAL to give teacher workshops on behavior issues? Would you consider asking the Guardian Angels to come to the most troubled schools? Would you consider the Scared-Straight program where the most incorrigible students pay a visit to prisons to see for themselves where their behavior is heading? Escalating behaviors that I refer to are not simply bad, they are crimes of assault. I believe you'll agree with me on this and for the sake of Waterbury, for our teachers and our students who wish to learn, these behaviors must end. I thank you all for your service on the School Board and for your time tonight.

**Lisa Lessard, 905 Pearl Lake Road, had the following comments:** First, I also want to say congratulations to Wendell Cross and if they basically did everything they needed to do, which sounds like they did, and they got a thumbs-up from Stephan Pryor, our Commissioner, maybe we should go into that school, see what they're doing, so each and every school within our district can do the same exact thing, just saying.

The cost of discipline declines, school plan would cost half of early proposal. I also do agree, to a certain degree, understand that we do have problems within our school system especially one of my good friends, Cindy Hill, always came in front of this

podium when it came to bullying and when I read about that boy in the newspaper that she was speaking of my heart broke because I knew she'd be here tonight speaking about just that. So yes we do need disciplinarians in our school but I think there's other ways and other avenues we could possibly do this. I know that we couldn't do the Deans of Discipline, this is an okay plan "b" but I do think that, I agree with the Mayor here, that basically it doesn't do everything it needs to do and there might be another avenue. We do have school counselors; we do have principals within the school. No, the shouldn't be taking care of these problems, but right now the City taxpayers don't have money, period, for anything. They're saying the State is broke, they're saying the Feds are broke; well we the City taxpayers are broke. So you're asking, begging, and pleading going forward for 7.3 million dollars for our schools – asking, begging, and pleading but here you go wanting to open another school that we're going to bond, which is basically taking money from us City taxpayers we don't have to give. I understand you need more money but we don't have it to give anymore. I don't know anybody in this City that has one dime or one penny that they can spare so when Jason Van Stone, being Commissioner, and Patrick Hayes being Commissioner – one being a republican and one being a democrat, I agree with both of them, you need to make sure that you do for the better interest of each and every child but also each and every child's parent because we don't have the money, one more penny, to give for anything, period. So stop spending our money lackadaisically and start spending our money the way it needs to be spent which is on each and every child, yes, but putting up new buildings, the buildings don't teach; the teachers do teach. A building is not going to do it, teachers will. Thank you.

**Jay Gonzalez, 47 Sharon Road, had the following comments:** I am a proud citizen of the City of Waterbury and I'm also a member of the Republican Town Committee in the 74<sup>th</sup> district and my reason for being here tonight and speaking to you tonight is to bring up the school which is scheduled to open, a new Waterbury Career Academy. I just feel that the School Board should strongly consider possibly naming it after a Hispanic being that the rising population in the City of Waterbury, growing Hispanic influence around the City of Waterbury. I just feel it's only fitting especially since the majority of the students in there are probably going to be of Latino descent, you know I think it's only fitting that this should be considered just the same way that Reed School had the same backing to be named after a black man, it was a huge following for it and rightfully so and I feel only the same thing for the Hispanic community being that we have so many schools and we're putting up a new school now and if it's gonna be predominantly, if most of the school children there are going to be of Latino descent, I think it should be something that should be considered and you know I feel it's really only fitting to consider it, not necessarily any specific person, but I feel it's something strongly that I feel about. And I know there is rising support for that so I just ask the Board members to keep that in your thoughts when you are thinking of a name for it because I know it is something that would be supported by that general area as well as it would be great for the students that do attend that school. That's all I really came here to speak about and thank you for your time.

**Thomas Van Stone, 925 Oronoke Road, had the following comments:** I come here as a member of the Leadership Greater Waterbury Program through the Greater Waterbury Chamber of Commerce. I'm a part of a group that was tasked with putting together a project centered around beautification and the community. The idea that our group came up with was to engage the students in the City of Waterbury to beautify a

specific area within the City and all along the way teach them to respect their environment and show them how they can clean up their environment and take care of their environment. We currently have a request into the Connecticut State Department of Transportation to focus our efforts on the walkway that goes above Route 8 North that ends up on Ledgeside Avenue and Wilson Street and then ends up down at the bottom by the MacDermid Corporation. We come to you, or I come to you today, to seek your input and your support. I know we can't ask questions and get feedback tonight but my hope is that we can start a dialogue to potentially engage the students with our program to take sections of the wall leading up to that walkway and different steps going up that walkway and give them their own canvas for their own unique mural. The thought is that we would accept mock-ups of what they would like to paint there, to post there, then as long as it's not objectionable we'd love to give them a space on that walkway and let them go and paint or decorate that section, give them something to put their name on that they'd see going up and down the highway. So we ask for your suggestions on that project tonight, whether you feel it's feasible, whether you would be willing to help us engage the principals and art teachers in the district to bring the students forward for that and I look forward to having that conversation. The letter that I have here I sent in, I don't know if you received, but I sent it earlier in the week to the address for the Department of Education and if you'd like I can submit it now for your records and it has my contact information. Thank you very much for your time.

**Heather Greene, 227 Robbins Street, had the following comments:** I'm here because I'm confused about something with the report cards. I guess in middle school, I don't know how it works in high school and if it works the same in elementary school, but there are children who are getting "F's" on their report cards and still receiving second honors and I personally have a problem with that and I know other parents do. I always thought that straight "A's" was one, that would be first honors, and then "A's" and "B's" would be second honors like when I was in school. I don't think, a "C" is okay, "D's" and "F's", why are we rewarding the kids for these? We're lowering their expectations for an education and that's why I wanted to come here tonight to address that and see what we could do about that. I volunteer at my daughter's school and I see kids walk all over their teachers sometimes and I don't think giving them a second honor and saying oh, you got a "D" or an "F" in that class, I don't see why we're doing that.

The other thing I wanted to bring up on another note is because I am a middle school parent, is the dates for the open houses that we had this year because back on September 28<sup>th</sup> we had our open house when the Fireball Run came and I really wanted to bring my daughter but because I volunteer I had a commitment to do the book fair at the open house and I know a lot of other parents and even staff wanted to do the same thing, go to that with their children and we were unable to. And now we have another one coming up and it's on Valentine's Day. So it's just a disappointment for I think all the middle school staff, some parents, and maybe even some students that it's two days in one year that it's kind of like we're getting the bad dates. So I don't know if there's anything we could do about that but I just wanted to bring that up. Thank you.

**Upon a motion by Commissioner Sweeney and duly seconded by Commissioner Hayes, it was voted unanimously to return to the regular order of business at 7:11 p.m.**

STANGO: Motion made and seconded. Any discussion? Hearing none - all in favor, opposed, motion passes unanimously.

## **8. SUPERINTENDENT'S REPORT**

SUPERINTENDENT: Thank you Mr. President. I apologize to the Board this evening, we are looking at a Superintendent's Report and not a Notification but we have some special guests in the audience so I thought it would be acceptable to the Board this evening. Before I begin, I do want to say that school reform is such a difficult task, it's been very much, we've been very much involved with reform over the last year upon my arrival to Waterbury and I just wanted to say, looking out in the audience this evening, it's nice to be surrounded by friends and fellow colleagues that have been superintendent's and been in the trenches working side by side with me and I do want to recognize, before I set the backdrop for Dr. Ullman tonight and her SEED presentation on teacher evaluation and principal evaluation, is recognize Dr. Bob Villanova. Bob's been working very closely, he's from the Center for School Change, and has been working very closely with us in the training of our Instructional Leadership Directors. He's been a phenomenal colleague of mine, a long-time Superintendent out of Farmington and a Superintendent of the Year and he's certainly made my work bearable with regard to reform and guiding me through the waters. So Bob, I just wanted to recognize you this evening.

And also another fellow colleague of mine, Dr. Ullman, she's been right by my side with reform in Waterbury. She's the Senior Advisor to the State Commissioner of Education and Diane has also been involved with the, she's been working closely with the Commissioner. She's been a long-time Superintendent in Simsbury and also a Superintendent of the Year in 2012 from the Connecticut Association of Public School Superintendents. She's here tonight, again, I think a favor and a friend to the Waterbury Superintendent, so I just want to acknowledge her and personally thank her. I do want to just say to the Board also I've provided you a chronology and a timeline of events with regard to SEED. And just for the audience and the public, just one second Dr. Ullman, just some facts for the public who are viewing this evening that we have been working on this, upon my arrival in 2011, and Dr. Sequeira and Mrs. Cullinan have done a phenomenal job and I know the Board has taken a true interest in this and I give kudos to the Board in starting the Board of Education Ad-hoc Committee. You've been looking at reform and teacher and principal evaluation and that's been ongoing and that we know that the district had certainly started what's called a district professional development and evaluation committee and has reviewed the SEED model and selected for Waterbury's plan some components of the State model. And I know that all of us are aware that this can be very heavy lifting work, very anxious times, but we have had tremendous support from the State Department of Education under Dr. Ullman's leadership and so we're very fortunate with that. You'll see a presentation tonight with regards to the broad-base; just the outline of the SEED model, where Waterbury is with regards to that, what are our options and what are the next steps to move forward. So I do not want to take away from Dr. Ullman's presentation but again, I wanted to sincerely thank you for spending time with us this evening.

ULLMAN: Thank you very much. What a great night to be in Waterbury. We get to celebrate Wendell Cross School. There's nothing more thrilling I'm sure for the Board, and certainly for the Superintendent, then to see a school really soar. A little true

confession here, the principal was one of my students many years ago. I didn't want him to remind me how many years ago but it's also a special thrill for me to see him achieve this honor. I'm sure you're all very proud.

I've been to Waterbury, probably half a dozen times over the last several years, and more often now that Dr. Ouellette is here, and I have to tell you and I've been working teachers and administrators and every time I come I'm impressed with the willingness of the staff here, the administrators, the teachers, to learn and grow. I sense a really true desire to do the best by children and I think that's the mark of a school system that's on the move and I think Waterbury is on the move. I also know that Dr. Ouellette is juggling many, many reform priorities right now and the seriousness with which she has taken this work on evaluation is truly impressive and I'm here because I want to support her and I'll say it publically that I will do whatever I can to help Waterbury succeed in this particular initiative, I think that you deserve it. So what I'm gonna do this evening is I'm gonna give you a very broad overview of the evaluation system that was adopted by the State Board of Education on June 27<sup>th</sup> of 2012 after two years of work by a committee that had representatives from all stakeholders – administrators, teachers, teachers' unions, the CABE Board, the CAPSS Board, the Connecticut Association of Schools, community members, university members, a very broad-based group worked on this for two years and their work was accepted by the State Board of Education, like I said, on June 27, 2012. From that point we selected 10 pilot districts who, they applied and were accepted to be the first districts to go through the system and we are learning a lot of lessons from those districts throughout this year so that we can actually make this model better going forward. So I'm gonna give you this broad overview, then I'd like to talk to you a little bit about the financial support that the State Department is gonna provide to school districts as they move forward with this initiative, and then also talk to you about some of the training requirements and how this work actually dovetails with the other work that Waterbury has undertaken. So, with that, I'm just gonna start and I'm gonna probably go through these slides quickly. If you want to stop me at any one of them, please just indicate, and I'm happy to spend as much time as you would like but I would also like to make sure that I can answer your questions. So at the end I'll just ask you if there's any questions but along the way just let me know if you want me to stop and you want to ask me anything.

So SEED, the name is important, it's the Educator Evaluation and Development System. So if we only wanted to assess teachers and give teachers a rating and let that be the end of the story we wouldn't have the "development" word in there. But, in fact, if this system is gonna be any good, and if it's gonna really raise the skill level of teachers across the State, it's gonna focus on the development of those teachers. So it's equal parts, assessing where they are in terms of their capacity but also providing them the support that they need to get better at their jobs. And we, I think, probably as a profession, not done as good a job with that over time but this model pays a lot of attention to that. You probably know this as a Board but it's something I remember every time I talk about SEED and that is nothing matters more than the teacher who stands in front of 25 students on Monday morning, what that teacher is able to do, how they know how to reach their students, how they know how to differentiate for the variety of learners in front of them, the degree to which they're confident about their ability to help their children learn, that's the school that's going to move and be successful. So this whole model is really focus on building up the skills of teachers, they matter more than anything else in the equation.

So in order to support teachers this model does several things. It defines what effective practice is, we use the Connecticut Standards, and there's a rubric that's used so that administrators can go in and observe teachers and know exactly what to look for. It also provides us really specific information about where teachers have strengths and where they have needs for growth and here's where you begin to hear the notion of then addressing those needs that arise out of evaluation. And I think pretty much, no matter what stage of your career you are in, there are areas in which you can grow.

We also need to recognize that we have some highly skilled teachers who can probably support other colleagues. We also recognize that as teachers move on and have more and more years in the career they have wisdom that we have to find ways that they can share with others and we haven't been particularly good with that as a profession so we're really hoping that out of this system we can find ways to help teachers become master teachers and then go back and support others. They're closer to the classroom work, they know what works in classrooms, and we'd like to be able to design structure so they can actually be peer supporters.

We also have to be able to recognize those teachers who do an outstanding job. I saw a great example of it this evening but there are more ways that we can do so for those of you who have reached the top of your profession you really worked over a long career, what does it look like when you're a distinguished teacher and what kind of things could we provide you, what kind of access can we give you to continue learning.

Lastly, and not least important, but maybe one of the most important things, is we have to ensure feasibility and implementation. So this is a demanding system, it's gonna require principals to be in classrooms a lot observing teaching, it's gonna require principals to be very skilled at going into classrooms and accessing what's going on and whether or not it's in the right direction or whether it needs redirection. But that amount of time has to come from somewhere so we're trying to help districts and school leaders figure out how to reallocate their time and how to use their time a little bit differently so that this, there's feasibility of implementation.

So, as I stated earlier, the State Board of Education developed guidelines and that's what was adopted by the State Board on June 27<sup>th</sup>. Following that, the State Department of Education developed SEED which is a full-blown written plan that is built off the guidelines. So it's a model that districts could just take and use as is or they could design their own based on the guidelines but we felt that it would give school districts a really good idea of what those guidelines look like when they're in practice. So we actually have a fully developed SEED model, it's up on our website, the website is [www.connecticutseed.org](http://www.connecticutseed.org) and if you go to that address you'll find both the guidelines and the specific model. I mentioned earlier we have 10 pilot districts, they're all using the State model this first year out, they may modify it a little bit after the first year but they started out with the State model because it was fully written and a good sort of launching pad for the work.

Sort of a big overview here, in this system, which by the way is required for all districts in Connecticut, it's State law, teachers will be evaluated using what we say are multiple sources. It would not be a fair assessment of a teacher to use a single measure to say whether or not a teacher was effective or not. So this model is built on the fact that 45%

of a teacher's evaluation will be based on how well their students learn in their class that year. So we're using a growth model where we ask teachers to set goals in the Fall and to work hard towards those goals and to see student growth.

We also, another part of it, is that we observe teacher practice in the classroom, we have to help administrators get really good at this, but 40% of an evaluation is based on what's observed while they're teaching. So part of it is student outcomes and part of it is the actual teaching practice.

Ten percent would be peer or parent feedback. We have surveys we can offer districts, districts can design their own, they can find their own, there's a lot of flexibility here, but we ask districts to count 10% of a teacher's evaluation to be either parent or peer feedback. I would say that the pilot districts are using parent feedback as their mechanism.

Five percent of the evaluation is the whole school student learning or student feedback. Most of the pilot districts are using the SPI; we talked about that this evening, as the whole school measure. So those are the general components of teacher evaluation and you'll see that the student growth and the 5% which is the school-wide student learning, those two pieces that are dark combine to an outcome rating. Then the practice rating is the parent feedback or peer feedback and the observation of practice. So 50%, 50% combines to 100%. So this is actually a calculus to determine where a teacher falls at an end of a cycle which is usually around the end of May or the beginning of June in a school year.

Administrators will be evaluated similarly. Forty-five percent of their evaluation will be based on the student learning goals for the school, not individual students but the school goals. Another 45% will be on leadership practice, how good are they at carrying out the responsibilities of the principal with a heavy emphasis on whether or not they're able to lead for learning in their school. Ten percent stakeholder feedback – that would be either teacher feedback or parent feedback. And then five percent would be how well are they growing teachers in their school? Is there evidence that teachers are becoming better under their leadership? Again, an outcome rating and a practice rating which equals 100%. So very parallel systems – it's an observation of practice and student learning outcomes and then feedback.

Evaluation process is described in three distinct steps. In talking with Dr. Ouellette today, Waterbury already has this in place, this is not going to be anything new for Waterbury, but there's a goal setting phase that takes place in the Fall where the teacher and the administrator, their evaluator sit down and decide what the learning goals are for students in that classroom, that year. They have a mid-year check-in on November 15, I'm sorry a mid-year check-in in January or February where they sit down and say how's it going, are you making progress towards those goals, if not, let's try to figure out why not, what could we do to make it better. Also, in school districts, and this may be the case in some Waterbury schools, where the student population changes significantly from September to January, the teacher and the administrator have an opportunity to reset goals based on the new students who are in the classroom. And then there's an end of the year conference. An important part of this is asking the teacher to reflect on their own progress for the year – how do you think you did in each

of these categories and that becomes the focus of the discussion between the evaluator and the teacher at the end of the year.

Similar cycle, it looks like many more boxes but this is the administrator cycle, it's basically the same – a goal setting period, a mid-year check-in, and an end of year summative evaluation.

At the end of the year teachers and administrators, and this is really new for Connecticut, to put it into context about 40 states in the Country are using a very similar model, we've made it our own in terms of the percentages that we use. We probably have a lower percentage focused on student-learning outcomes than many states. And I think we have, I believe we have the appropriate amount, so, at the end of the year, this is true for teachers as well as administrators, the rubrics are all four-point rubrics so somebody would be rated "exemplary", "proficient", although I think we're going to change that word to "accomplished", "developing", and "below standard". This is a tool for helping us know where the talent is working, where it needs help, and where the trouble spots are within the school system. So it really helps delineate, and professional development plans need to be tied to where the teachers and administrators are in their performance levels. "Below standard" would be not meeting performance and would single some serious need for corrective work. Obviously "developing" means that you're not where you need to be but you're making progress and if you want to continue you have to make progress and become "proficient". We expect that probably, and this is another culture shift, probably for here as well as the places that I've worked, we generally have given teachers pretty glowing feedback, everybody's good, everybody's above average, we expect a very small percentage of teachers to be "exemplary" because the standard is so high. These are the people who are ready to teach other teachers; they're the people who are at the top of their profession. The vast majority of your teachers will fall in that "proficient" range, some will probably be "developing", and you may have some "below standard". But I want to point out is the box at the bottom of this slide which is critically important, your Superintendent will bring to you a proposal for a teacher evaluation plan for Waterbury before the school year is out. In that plan she will propose to you a model for determining effectiveness and ineffectiveness. So, and it says here, that each district shall define effectiveness and ineffectiveness using a pattern of ratings, of summative ratings from the new evaluation system. So you'll have to decide, as a school system, what pattern of ratings make somebody effective and where do you draw the line and say you're no longer effective? So in the SEED model, like I said, it's a fully-blown model, for example if a teacher has been in the profession for a while and they receive two years of "developing" and they're not making progress towards "proficiency", they could be, if you choose, defined as "ineffective". "Ineffective" becomes the subject of employment discussions; is this somebody who remains in the school system? I would say prior to this evaluation model the standard for having that employment discussion, do you continue employment or not, it was in the Statute and it was a far lower standard than this. And so this is a tool to really kind of begin to focus on those teachers who really need to improve their schools. "Incompetent" is the word that's used in the Statute, you had to be completely incompetent to be in a position where your job was perhaps in jeopardy. Now we're saying ineffectiveness. Waterbury will have the ability to define what effectiveness and ineffectiveness is using the ratings and you'll have to define what pattern you want to use. I would stop to say that there is a professional development and evaluation committee that's functioning here, has about 25 members from all the various groups in town, and they're the ones that are going to

be working with the Superintendent and the staff to develop the model here in Waterbury and this is one of the issues they'll be wrestling with. The Board of Education must adopt the model and that model then goes to the State Department for approval. So you will see the model before it actually goes for approval and it will have to be something that you agree with in terms of how you want to structure evaluation here in Waterbury.

This is just a slide that talks about the importance of support and development for teachers. There are three points at which you would ask a teacher whether or not they need professional learning support. And I say this in the most positive way because I think everybody should be a learner. When they set their goals we should ask them what do you need to learn in order to achieve that goal? In the middle of the year when we have that conference, that mid-year conference, we should say is there anything I can do to help you achieve those goals that you set? If you're struggling and your students aren't making progress, what can we do together to help you learn to do the work better? And then certainly at the end of the year you would ask the teacher what have you learned and what would you like to learn next in order to do a better job in the classroom? Multiple points in the year, and the more its linked to the specific teacher's performance the more effective it's gonna be. We also will have data systems that will allow us to look for patterns across the school district – within a school patterns, across the school district, and then also at the State level so that as a district you can respond if a lot of teachers at the elementary level need a certain kind of help because they're struggling with a certain learning objective for kids, then you can tailor your professional development so that those teachers get what they need. And I think this is a sign that the era of everybody come sit in a room and hopefully you'll get something out of this, that's gone by, it's really gonna be much more tailored to the individual teacher needs.

These are the pilot districts that are working right now on evaluation. A range of districts from little, tiny one-school districts out in the northeast corner of the State to Bridgeport, large urban district – Norwalk, Windham, so you can see that we tried to get a spread so that we would get good feedback from a variety of types of districts – urban, suburban, rural. All of the districts are using the SEED model in their pilot and some of them are using what's called peer assistance where they're actually using their expert teachers to support their, some of the teachers who have performance struggles. We just, on Monday, heard feedback from the Neag School of Education. The Neag School has been commissioned to do a study of the implementation of this new evaluation system. They gave us feedback on phase one because they just gathered all their data so they told us what they learned from the pilot districts in that first goal setting phase. And what they told us is generally that the model seems solid, it seems like it works, but that we have to do a better job of training. And we did have some conversations today about what that training needs to be like. This work, I just want to really emphasize that it's a significant shift of practice for principals who are going to evaluate teachers; it's a significant shift for the Central Office who is gonna evaluate principals; it's also a shift for teachers in terms of how their performance is judged. We have not, as a profession in general, I'm not talking about Waterbury, we have not done a good job of finding where people's strengths and weaknesses are and helping them grow in a very clear way and I think this system will help us do that.

So the feedback thus far is that step up your training, State Department, it's got to be better, it's got to be sooner, and we were just talking today about when we can situate

some of that training for Waterbury but thus far they're saying the model does work so we're pleased about that. We'll get more feedback after the mid-year, now the principals in the pilot districts are doing the mid-year review and we'll get feedback after that as well.

So this is just a list of the staff, I had formerly been Chief Talent Officer, moved out of that position, so the slide needs to be updated. That's the end of the formal presentation. I just want to give you a couple of other pieces of information I think are important to a school board and one is that there's been a lot of press about this as an unfunded mandate and as a result of hearing that feedback and actually doing a cost analysis, Commissioner Pryor is very committed to subsidizing the cost of school districts in two specific ways – one is that there will be data systems that are needed to collect all this information, the individual principals need a data system to take their observations and begin to look at patterns within their school, the district will need it to be able to look at patterns across the district, and the State Department is gonna ask for information. So we are in the process of determining several providers for these data systems and they will be subsidized and I think, while I can't tell you the exact amount because obviously the budget is still a work in progress, but there is a very sincere commitment to supporting this work for local school boards and subsidizing a good part of it. The cost will vary, and I suspect that if somebody picks a very expensive model the amount of the subsidy won't cover the whole thing, but there are also good models that aren't so costly. So depending on which model that a district chooses that's how much of the cost would be addressed. Also, in order for this system to work we have to insure that every principal has the skills to go into a classroom, watch teaching, and make an accurate assessment of what they see. And that assessment has to be tagged to the Connecticut Standards for Teacher. So there's a necessity for every principal in Waterbury and across the State to pass a proficiency assessment whether or not they can make accurate observations. And there are multiple ways to make that assessment, to make that proficiency happen. Some of them are more costly than others but that's another area that the State Department is gonna subsidize to the greatest extent possible so that districts aren't having to bear the burden of that particular cost.

The timeline for implementation – the State Board of Education, if anybody was listening to that today, they adopted a modified timeline from, originally every district in the State was gonna implement every aspect of this model in the Fall of 2013. We heard a lot of significant concern from school boards, superintendents, and so the response has been that the districts will have choices. You can still choose to implement the whole model with all teachers and administrators in the district, if you so choose, but you can also propose multiple ways – you can say for the first year we're gonna try it on a third of our schools and then negotiate which third that would be. You can talk about whether or not there are certain groups of teachers that you would evaluate the first year out and others that would wait till the second year. So that your professional development and evaluation committee will have I think a very robust discussion about that decision point, the Superintendent will be part of those discussions. If they come up with a reasonable proposal, the superintendent would bring that to you. What the State Board adopted also provides that the Superintendent is the ultimate authority of what plan comes to the Board of Education. So you have choices in terms of what you're gonna do for 2013/14, in terms of how much of the Waterbury administrative and teaching staff will be under this new evaluation system. Those who are not will be evaluated using the old system.

So everybody will still be evaluated, it's just that you can choose from everybody or just specific groups or specific schools. The one thing that's non-negotiable is that all elements of the model, as I showed you on that circle, the four components, they all have to be in place for whoever you're evaluating. And the rationale for that, and I think I said it in the beginning, is that we are of the firm, very firm belief that it is unfair to judge anybody by one indicator alone. So we're saying that the multiple indicators are necessary to get an accurate assessment of anybody's performance. And so whatever model you choose you'll be implementing all those components for the category of teachers and principals that you choose. The State will be providing training; they'll be providing training to the Central Office leaders so that they can evaluate principals. We'll be providing training so that principals are skilled in evaluating teachers. There's a lot of plans for really good training that are coming on board. We've learned some very important things from the pilot districts and we've improved the training models very significantly. The one group that we did not do a good job with is teachers. Teachers got an "orientation" to the evaluation system. What we've learned is that they need to know much more about it if they're gonna be a true partner in the discussion of the work. One of the other things that we've learned from the pilot thus far, which is truly exciting, is that almost every pilot district has said to us that the conversation between the evaluator and the teacher about student learning has been ratcheted up in very significant ways. Teachers are thrilled with the conversations they're having with their administrators, the administrators are thrilled, it's changing the game in terms of what we talk about in evaluation and it's all focused on student learning. It's exciting for those involved in the pilot and I'm truly excited for what it will mean for the State going forward.

Just in conclusion, I feel like I have to say that I've known Dr. Ouellette for many years in various capacities and I've also been watching her work here in Waterbury and she's done some pretty great things for this school system and you are poised to do a truly outstanding job with evaluation. And, as a matter of fact, we were talking just earlier today, the work that you're doing with the Center for Educational Leadership and the Center for School Change in Connecticut in terms of really focusing on teaching and learning, if that work continues and it gets integrated with evaluation, you will be far ahead of most school districts in Connecticut. So there is tremendous potential and I really, lots of kudos to Dr. Ouellette for bringing that initiative on board and really making the Central Office responsive to the schools and the ways in which you're focusing on student learning is gonna pay off for this district in the long run. And there's just so much to be proud of here and I'm particularly grateful that I've been invited in to help. So, with that, I'll stop talking and see if you have questions.

STANGO: Commissioner Brown.

BROWN: Welcome, thank you for your presentation, it clarified a lot of things. I just have two quick questions. During the evaluation process, how are teachers being scored – is it "a", "b", "c" or is it those things that you showed – accomplishment...

ULLMAN: For the student learning component there's a four-point rubric. There's actually a matrix that combines the two in the end but it's a four-point rubric for how well students learn. There's also a four-point rubric for their practice and those become the two axis and then the score is sort of the combination of those. And, interestingly, if any one of those is out of whack, their professional practice looks great but their student

learning isn't so great, then we say okay, we need more information, that doesn't seem right, or it could be the reverse, student learning is great but their practice isn't, then the question is so let's go back and talk some more because something's not right with those ratings. But it is a four-point scale – two axis, student learning, the 50% and then the other 50%.

BROWN: And the other thing is has there been any discussion about teachers who are really taking on very difficult students in terms of a weighted scale. In other words, I have a class, I've got 10 special ed students, I'm a teacher who has a classroom, every school has them, right, and I'm just wondering how we factor in the teacher who really has the most difficult classes.

ULLMAN: So this is one of the elements of Connecticut's plan that differs from most other states and I think is particularly effective. What we don't want to do is, you know, usually the principal knows who the teacher is who can handle a lot of problems and actually still move students, you don't want to penalize those teachers. So in the goal setting process, this is where it happens, the teacher and the administrator look at the students in the class, they look at the data they have, maybe these are really struggling students, what the teacher and the administrator decide is what's a reasonable growth for that group of students and it might be that the teacher says for this group of five, this is how much I think I can grow them. For this other group of 10, you know what, they're in better shape, they're gonna move even more, and these three over here, they're ready to soar, so I might have three different targets based on, it's all based on where the student is starting and how much can you help them grow.

BROWN: Thank you.

STANGO: Commissioner Hayes.

HAYES: I thank you for being here and also your support you've given us. I think Commissioner Brown sort of touched on where I was so I'll go a little bit further. We have a student growth and development at 45% as a model, I mean, I'm trying to figure out how we compare teachers, as Liz was talking about, I mean in almost any job place you got your real good workers, you're gonna give them the tougher assignments, so how do we really, I'm just wondering how that's gonna work out not only within our district but within the State if in fact, can we keep best teachers here in Waterbury if in fact it's a little bit easier to work in the other surrounding districts?

ULLMAN: So it's just as possible for a teacher in Waterbury who has the toughest students to be an exemplary teacher, it's just as possible as it is for a teacher in an affluent suburb to be an exemplary teacher. As a matter of fact I think there's almost more room here because if a teacher can show that they really impact student achievement because those students have a long way to grow, they actually show up better. So it's that notion of setting the targets, starting where the students are and how much can you move them. Often times if you're in an affluent suburb the students actually come to school with a lot of what I would call social capital so the teachers aren't working nearly as hard as some of the teachers with struggling students and I think the teachers who work really hard with struggling students actually have the opportunity to show what they can do more in this system. And one thing I didn't talk about when I was going through the slides is that 45% is actually broken into two parts –

22 ½ percent if you teach in a subject or grade that has a test, that's 22 ½ percent; if you don't then you don't have it. So the other 22 ½ percent is what we call non-standardized measures so assessments that are in your curriculum, district assessments or school-based assessments count so the teachers actually have a say in what those assessments are. If in Waterbury, and I know that Anne Marie Cullinan is instrumental in working on curriculum, I know you're gonna have imbedded assessments in that curriculum, that's part of what is going to be used to judge them as well. But, again, you can be exemplary if you move your students no matter where they are on the continuum. So I think there's an equal shot at being really being noticed and being exemplary for a teacher here as anywhere else.

HAYES: Just a follow-up on that 45%, I think you made a comment that we're not, is that percentage, the measurement of student growth that we're not using, as such a high percent they might be using in other parts of the Country? Basically are we scoring them on test scores?

ULLMAN: We have a lower percentage than most states in terms of standardized test scores. For many states the whole 45% is standardized and in many states they're also buying more assessments and that's not our approach. Our approach is if we have them we should use them and if we don't we should rely on the curriculum, the assessments that are in the curriculum. As we look at how students do, we just want to see over time that they're improving and so when we look at the Common Core Assessments when they come on they'll be a good measure for us whether or not our internal assessment, but we actually have a smaller percentage on that standardized test than almost any of the states that I've seen, and I've been looking sort of nationally, about what the percentages are.

HAYES: I would be interested in getting the feedback from your mid-year reviews in particular I guess from Norwalk or Windham that are similar to our district, just so we have a feel for what's going on. You clarified the 45% for me because I wasn't clear exactly what that was. Like I said, some teachers don't teach to tests, that was the other question I was gonna ask.

ULLMAN: So they just use whatever they have. I was actually talking to a PE teacher today and they have some fitness assessments that they do, that would be, they're embedded in the curriculum, that's what they would use. There's lots of categories of teachers where there is no standardized test. I would say, we have a Power Point that will be up on the SEED website that the Neag School presented on Monday that showed their feedback and so clearly you just go to [connecticutseed.org](http://connecticutseed.org) and you can see the results from the first phase. When we get the results from the second phase we'll post that as well.

HAYES: Thank you.

STANGO: Vice President Harvey.

HARVEY: Thank you again for the presentation. I'm just curious, you mentioned your pilot program, have you received any feedback from the teachers as far as the trust factor with this evaluation process?

ULLMAN: So it's the underpinning of everything. If the trust isn't there between the evaluator and the teacher, and there is some feedback from the Neag School and you'll see that in the Power Point, it's pretty new, I think the real test of the trust will come at the mid-year and the final and the Neag School is talking to teachers, I mean they're going and talking to teachers individually and in small groups, they're also talking to the principals, but they're really drilling down and saying to teachers we need to hear what would make this better. And just so you know, it's called an implementation study because their goal is to tell us what we can do to implement it better. It's not a study designed to see if the system actually helps students grow, it's more like you know what can we do to help teachers do this and I think we're already beginning to hear that in cases where there's a good relationship between the two, it works better. And so part of our training is gonna address that whole notion of the trust factor, how do you build it? I think you build it by listening to teachers, not just talking at them, but making sure you hear their point of view, that you have the discussion, that you have mutually agreed upon goals, conversation again that you listen to them as they assess their own work, and you, you know, it's a partnership. And honestly I think in many places that's a new combination for teachers to feel because evaluation always felt like an onerous thing. If it's gonna be about growth, it has to be based on trust.

STANGO: Any others? Dr. Ullman, we thank you for coming. Dr. Ouellette we thank you for arranging this this evening.

## **9. PRESIDENT'S COMMENTS**

STANGO: Just very briefly because of our full agenda and the guests that we had tonight, I just want to note that Tuesday of next week is President Abraham Lincoln's 204<sup>th</sup> birthday. Also of note this year is the 150<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the Emancipation Proclamation. And I have a quote from President Lincoln. I offer you this quote on his ideas and outlook on education. "Upon the subject of education, I can only say that I view it as the most important subject which people may be engaged". So we are, us, engaged in important subjects, as we knew.

Also this evening on the Agenda is Executive Session, however, that is taken off, we no longer need it so it's off the Agenda this evening.

Next item on the Agenda is the Consent Calendar. Does anyone wish to remove anything from the Consent Calendar?

BROWN: I ask Item 10.10 be removed.

STANGO: Any others?

*President Stango proceeded to read the Consent Calendar list, Items 10.1 through 10.9 and 10.11 through 10.14.*

## **10. CONSENT CALENDAR**

**Upon a motion by Commissioner Sweeney and duly seconded by Commissioner Harvey, it was voted unanimously to approve the Consent Calendar, items 10.1 through 10.9 and 10.11 through 10.14 as listed:**

- 10.1 With the approval of the Committee on Finance, the Superintendent of Schools recommends permission be granted to Kazumi Yamashita-Iverson, Maloney Magnet School, to apply for the Elgin Heinz Outstanding Teacher Award given by the United States-Japan Foundation.
- 10.2 With the approval of the Committee on Finance, the Superintendent of Schools recommends permission be granted for Robert Perriello, Bunker Hill PE, to apply for the SNAG Golf Equipment grant.
- 10.3 With the approval of the Committee on Finance, the Superintendent of Schools recommends permission be granted to Joseph Russo, Wallace Middle School PE, to apply for the Sports Authority Local Community Support-Fitness Related grant.
- 10.4 With the approval of the Committee on Finance, the Superintendent of Schools recommends permission be granted to Sara Guerrero, Wilson School PE, to apply for the Fuel Up to Play – Play 60 Breakfast Blitz contest/sweepstakes.
- 10.5 With the approval of the Committee on Finance, the Superintendent of Schools recommends permission be granted to Madeline Nolan, Crosby High School Health, to apply for the Waterbury Youth Council Positive Youth Development Mini-grant.
- 10.6 With the approval of the Committee on Finance, the Superintendent of Schools recommends permission be granted to Tara Linskey, West Side Middle School Health, to apply for the Waterbury Youth Council Positive Youth Development Mini-grant.
- 10.7 With the approval of the Committee on Finance, the Superintendent of Schools recommends permission be granted to Aline DiPietro, West Side Middle School PE, to apply for the Costco Charitable Giving Grant.
- 10.8 With the approval of the Committee on Curriculum, the Superintendent of Schools recommends permission be granted for Regan School to participate in the American Learning League Project.
- 10.9 With the approval of the Committee on Policy, the Superintendent of Schools recommends approval of the new policy entitled “Aquatics Safety” (6142.102), as attached.
- 10.10 REMOVED FROM CONSENT
- 10.11 With the approval of the Committee on School Personnel, the Superintendent of Schools recommends approval of an additional position of Pre-K to 8 School Principal for Carrington School (funded by FY14 General Fund).
- 10.12 With the approval of the Ad-hoc Advisory Committee for the Career Academy High School, the Superintendent of Schools recommends approval of the student eligibility criteria rubric for the Career Academy High School, as attached.

- 10.13 With the approval of the Committee on School Facilities and Grounds, the Superintendent of Schools recommends approval of the use of school facilities, at no charge, by the following school organizations and/or City departments:

<b>GROUP</b>	<b>FACILITIES AND DATES/TIMES</b>
Doreen Currier	Chase café: Wed., Feb. 13th 6:00-8:00 pm (Valentine Reading Night)
Mary Ann Marold	WAMS bldg.: Sat., May 11th 8:00am-1:00pm (School /Family /Community Partnership-2nd annual parent/youth fair)
Diana Monti	Reed café: Thurs., Feb. 21st (snow date: Mar. 7th) 5:30-8:00pm (Title I – DPA meeting)
Geraldo Reyes Jr. Mayor's Office	WAMS café & apron stage: Sat., April 13th 8:00am-2:00pm (Literacy Volunteers/Celebration of Cultures)
M. Rocco	W. Cross gym: Thurs., Feb. 21st 5:00-9:00 pm (snow date: 2/27/13) (Family Reading Night)
Lenny Calo	Crosby aud.: Sun., Feb. 17th 10:00am-noon (Blue Collar Union Mtg.)
L. Lombardi	Rotella aud.: Wed., Feb. 27th 5:00-9:00pm (Parents Workshop)
NorthWest Reg. Workforce Board Cathy Awwad	WAMS café: Thurs., Feb. 28th 5:30-7:30pm (community meeting re: City's HUD compliance)
*Mr. Retano	WSMS Library & classroom: Feb. thru June Thursdays 2:30 - 4:30 pm (CPEP Math program)
*Mayor's Office Joe Geary	Rotella aud.: Wed., Feb. 20th 7:00-8:30pm (town meeting regarding gun issues with Rep. Elizabeth Esty)

- 10.14 With the approval of the Committee on School Activities, the Superintendent of Schools recommends that permission be granted to the following organizations for use of school facilities with fees as outlined in their attached use of Building permit and subject to the receipt of all necessary deposits, insurance information, and/or life guard/CPR certifications, as listed.

<b>GROUP</b>	<b>FACILITIES AND DATES/TIMES</b>
<b><u>REQUESTING WAIVERS:</u></b>	
Wtby. Knights Otto Arroyo	Wilby auditorium: Sat., Feb. 16 <sup>th</sup> – 10:00 a.m. - 2:00 p.m. (sports awards ceremony) (\$400.)
Miss Greater Wtby. Jr. Pageant	Rotella auditorium, music rooms: Sat., March 9 <sup>th</sup> – 10 a.m. – 5:00 p.m. (Junior Pageant Fundraiser) (\$640.)
Long Hill Bible Church Keith Lott	Wilson gym & 2 rooms: Sundays 8:30-10:30 am (services) and the 4th Sat. each month 4:00-6:00pm (youth mtgs.) (\$2,880.)

**GROUPS NOT SUBJECT TO FEES OR WAIVER DUE TO TIME OF USE OR PREVIOUS WAIVER:**

Girl Scouts of CT.            WSMS café: Fri., May 3rd 4:00-9:00 pm  
Shannon Longo                (scout & father or special person dance)

---

Long Hill Bible Church      Wilson gym & 2 rms.: Feb.-June    Thursdays 6:30-9:00 pm  
Keith Lott                      (church meetings)

---

STANGO: Motion has been made and seconded. All in favor, opposed, motion carries.

## **11. ITEMS REMOVED FROM CONSENT**

### **Item #10.10**

HARVEY: Ladies and gentlemen, with the approval of the Committee on School Personnel, the Superintendent of Schools recommends approval of the attached job specifications for, and eight (8) new positions of “Student Behavior Technician”, as outlined in the Alliance District Application/Plan (funded by Title I and included in the Alliance Grant Application/WAMS Operating Grant), **SO MOVED.**

SWEENEY: **Second.**

STANGO: Any discussion? Commissioner Brown.

BROWN: **I would like to make a motion to refer this item back to the Personnel Committee for further review.**

HARVEY: **Second.**

STANGO: Motion is made and seconded. Any discussion on referring the item back to Personnel? Seeing none – all in favor, opposed, motion carries.

## **12. COMMITTEE ON GRIEVANCES**

**12.1 Upon a motion by Commissioner Hayes and duly seconded by Commissioner Van Stone, it was voted unanimously to approve that WTA Grievance 2012-13-07, heard by the Committee on December 17, 2012, be DENIED.**

STANGO: Motion made and seconded. Any discussion? All in favor, opposed, any abstentions? Motion carries.

## **13. COMMITTEE ON FINANCE**

**13.1 Upon a motion by Commissioner Van Stone and duly seconded by Commissioner Sweeney, with Commissioner Harvey “recusing”, it was voted to approve a Professional Services Agreement with AT&T (SNET Co.) to provide Wide Area Network Services for the Department of Education for the period of July 1, 2013 through and including June 30, 2018 (80% E-rate/20% General Fund FY14-19).**

STANGO: Motion has been made and seconded. Any discussion?

HARVEY: I will recuse myself from this vote.

STANGO: Any other discussion? All in favor, opposed, motion carries. Item #13.2 – Mr. Guidone, can you please clarify that item please.

GUIDONE: If I can. It's been quite a couple of days in the land of budget as you probably have followed. By now you may have seen a number of media accounts regarding the Governor's proposed budget to the Legislature. The first portion, which was announced yesterday, indicated, I think, what was an unexpected significant increase in ECS grants to municipalities throughout the state. In fact, by changes in some of the formulas as recommended by a task force, the City of Waterbury was projected to receive the largest increase of any city in the state of about 6.1 million. And that 6.1 million, I know we were all concerned some time back as to whether the 4.4 million dollar Alliance Grant portion of last year's ECS would be continued, that 6.1 million was over base which included the City's portion of the ECS Grant for the current year as well as the 4.4 million dollar Alliance Grant. As today's events unfolded and Governor actually made his proposal, further information was released and some further information that the Mayor received and were able to verify later in the day, is that figure now looks like it's about 10 million dollars over the current allocation. Response over the last day or two was where is this money coming from, since I think we all know the condition of the State's budget, and it looks like that the vast majority, if not all, has come from other portions of municipal aid to cities. In particular some traditional revenue items contained in the City's budget such as the Casino Funds, Pilot for State Owned Property, and it appears that, as we were able to do some further research today, it appears that the approximately 4 million dollars the City of Waterbury received from the State Pilot, and that's for payment in lieu of taxes for State property in the City of Waterbury, which is non-taxable, a total of about 4 million dollars, and that 4 million dollars was reduced, eliminated completely as a City revenue and added to the ECS allocation. This is all without any written guidelines or clarity on normal matters that you would have questions on and I imagine the taxpayers of the City would have questions on as well as other City officials. Is this to be treated as traditional ECS funds, is this to be treated much of like last year where all or portion of this increase would need to be applied for with various restrictions, would an MBR, that is a minimum budget requirement be applied to all or a portion of that? These are all questions that there is no answer to right now, there is matter of fact speculation on each and all sides of those issues as least as I've heard as the day has gone on and perhaps there will be some guidance over the next weeks and months. I imagine this is also a matter that will be of significant interest to legislators, obviously this is the Governor's proposed budget. With that level of uncertainty, and it could be looked at as good news or bad news depending on your particular perspective of the matter, I'm gonna recommend that the Board delay action on the proposed budget request until we are able to, hopefully, get at least some direction and maybe not complete, there may be some assumptions we'll all need to make when we ultimately adopt a budget request, even when the City ultimately adopts its budget. Although there may be some guidance as to what the intent of the new funding is, that won't be absolute until the Legislature acts on both the amount contained in the budget as well as any implementing statute that goes along with it. You may recall last year there was significant change in language, in statute, from the original proposal of the Alliance dollars to its ultimate conclusion. We met, the Superintendent and myself, Anne Marie and others, met with the Mayor and other City

officials earlier today and we decided this would be a prudent course of action. City officials are certainly concerned with what appears to be significant reduction in municipal aid although when compared to the bottom line the increase in ECS seems to offset other City revenue reductions. From my perspective this is relatively unfortunate, it's sets up almost the classic difference of opinion between municipality and its board of educations which we have not had and not seen for some period to time and I hoped we'd be able to avoid but I imagine, the interest being applied and the capital from both sides of those issues from both City officials attempting to address a budget and mill rate issues as well as school system officials who believe that additional resources are necessary be they to support existing operations as well as future reform endeavors. So with that I think it's best that we try to take these next days and weeks and try to get as much information as we can on these important topics and I come back to make a reasonable judgment. I do say this, this doesn't change my perspective what I believe to be the need to support the existing cost of the district as well as the new school, for those figures that have been provided to you. But in what manner or how they may be supported is clearly in question. Not only here but clearly throughout the State. So that would be my recommendation.

STANGO: Thank you Mr. Guidone. Back to you Commissioner Van Stone.

**13.2 Upon a motion by Commissioner Van Stone and duly seconded by Commissioner Hayes, it was voted unanimously to remove Item 13.2, approval of the 2013-14 Department of Education's budget request to the Mayor totaling \$163,000,000.00, and refer back to the Finance Committee.**

STANGO: Motion has been made and seconded. Any discussion? Commissioner Hayes.

HAYES: I believe it's a wise decision because we just really don't know where the money is coming from or if it's coming or whether it's taken out of one pocket to give to another. But I would hope, we did a few years ago when we had these problems, maybe through the Board President to the President of the Board of Aldermen, invite them to have not only Mr. Hadley, but if they have a Finance Committee, to be involved in our discussions prior to it getting out to where we're not in one corner and they're in another corner and they start asking us questions. They can get more informed if they send a representative to our Finance Committee meetings to hear just what we're up against. I recommend that we at least extend an invitation to them so they understand it and maybe they get ahead of where they're gonna be.

STANGO: Dr. Ouellette and Mr. Guidone will look into setting these things up as we go ahead.

SUPERINTENDENT: Yes, that was discussed a little bit at the meeting today.

GUIDONE: Certainly as we begin to develop clarity we'll certainly do that through the Finance Committee. I think Pat's point is that when we do meet it may be helpful that, there is a Budget Sub-committee of the Board of Aldermen, to invite them to attend those meetings. They have, on occasion, done that in the past, I think it's been helpful. Obviously all of our meetings are open but we can extend a direct invitation whenever

we are having a budget discussion either at Committee level or this level to any member of that Budget Sub-committee.

HAYES: Yes. Thanks.

STANGO: Vice President Harvey.

HARVEY: If I might add, we have our Liaison from the Board of Aldermen sitting directly in front of me and this is what I hope the Liaison is for but Pat, I agree, when we did that it seemed that things went a little bit more smoothly so if we could invite, and just have a specific meeting with the Aldermen and ourselves, members of the Finance Committee, I think that would be advantageous. But also that we utilize our Liaison who sits here through every single meeting, okay. So I just wanted to make sure, just to reemphasize that.

HAYES: Aldermen Hadley, I didn't even see you there. I said we should extend the invitation to him and the Budget Sub-committee people.

HADLEY: Are you asking for all the Aldermen or are you just asking for the Finance? I am Vice-chair of the Finance Committee but I would encourage you to invite other members as well.

STANGO: Thank you Alderman Hadley. Commissioner Sweeney.

SWEENEY: I agree that at this point we need to go back to the table and try and sort out what has happened over the last two days. As of late today I had even more extreme concerns over exactly what part of the ECS money, we're getting all these big figures thrown at us, is actually going to be workable ECS money that we can actually apply to our General Fund expenses. And at this point in time I am not confident that it will be anything more than it has been for the last five years because it would appear from the remarks from the Commissioner that this money will once again be held aside, it will need to be applied for. So on top of all this angst that we're gonna have over money shifting from the City side into the Education, we're gonna have to deal with, we're flat-funded from the State five years in a row and we still need money from the General Fund, and now the General Fund has been compromised by the moving of this money around. So I think we have to have some very deep and rich conversations about where this is going, get some hard answers from the State, and I know those will not come quickly, we have seen that before, budget sessions can drag way into July, we've seen that happen in the past. We do have a Legislative Committee tomorrow; the purpose of that meeting is to get some discussion around those things that we'll be addressing with our State Delegation on the 25<sup>th</sup> of this month. I encourage you all to be there to give your feedback because this is gonna be the time that we are gonna need to try and at least get someone on the floor of the Capital who can get us some answers because these are just some very confusing and puzzling figures that we're throwing out today and it's gonna take a lot to sort that out and relate back to what this district actually needs.

STANGO: Any other discussion? Seeing none – all in favor, opposed, motion carries.

#### **14. SUPERINTENDENT'S NOTIFICATION TO THE BOARD**

**Upon a motion by Commissioner Hayes and duly seconded by Commissioner Sweeney, it was voted unanimously to receive and place on file items 14.1 through 14.4, as listed:**

- 14.1 Athletic appointments effective immediately:  
Boland, Donald – Duggan PK – 8 Intramural Boys Basketball Coordinator/Coach.  
Capuano, Gene – Strength and Conditioning Coach, WHS.  
Erasmus, Matt – Head Boys' Swim Coach, CHS.  
Gibson, Ricardo – Reed PK – 8 Intramural Girls Basketball Coordinator/Coach.  
Martinez, Emmanuel – Assistant JV Girls' Basketball Coach, WHS.  
O'Toole, John – Assistant Boys' Swim Coach, CHS.  
Palermo, Stephen – Duggan PK – 8 Intramural Girls Basketball Coordinator/Coach.  
Phelan, Kyle – Gilmartin PK – 8 Intramural Boys Basketball Coordinator/Coach.  
Rosado, Deborah – Assistant Cheerleading Coach, KHS.  
Wallace, Matthew – Reed PK – 8 Intramural Boys Basketball Coordinator/Coach.
- 14.2 Grant funded appointments effective immediately:  
Calabro, Diane – Teacher, Kennedy High School Exit Criteria Program, funded by School Improvement.  
Freeman, Richard – Teacher, Crosby High School Exit Criteria Program, funded by School Improvement.
- 14.3 CMT Prep Program appointments, funded by Title I, effective immediately:  
Gaudiosi-Angurio, Karen – Teacher, Duggan School's CMT Prep Program.  
Jones, Wendy – Teacher, Duggan School's CMT Prep Program.  
Klem, Lisa – Substitute Teacher, Gilmartin School.  
Natoli (Bartoletti), Jane – Teacher, Gilmartin School.  
Phelan, Kyle – Teacher, Gilmartin School.  
Tracey, Andrew – Teacher, Gilmartin School.  
Zaccagnini, Krista – Teacher, Gilmartin School.
- 14.4 Leave of absence requests:  
Gibson, Jessica – Teacher of Visually Impaired, requesting an unpaid childrearing leave of absence from January 18, 2013 through June 30, 2013.

STANGO: Motion has been made and seconded. All in favor, opposed, motion carries. We're down to Item #15 – Unfinished Business of the Preceding Meeting Only. Okay, Item #16 – Other Unfinished, New, and Miscellaneous Business. Commissioner Sweeney.

SWEENEY: I would just like to inform everyone that CABE's Day on the Hill will be March 6 this year. I have already had some discussion with Mike Harris and he's putting into motion getting together some of our students to attend with us on that day. Mr. Guidone is working on busing and those other issues. I will try and update you as those things move along. But the more the merrier; please join us for CABE Day on the Hill on March 6.

STANGO: Any other discussion? Vice President Harvey.

HARVEY: Thank you, March 6 is my birthday. I just want to thank the Superintendent and Mike Harris for putting together the Black History Month calendar for the school district. I will send him an email thanking him for this very interesting, and I will go through it tomorrow before the snow. I want to also just take a minute to congratulate the WOW Youth Council for their program, the Black History Program "Celebrating a Rich Heritage". There were awards presented to various members of the community. The following day Granville Academy presented a book fair and program which was well attended, actually both of these events were well attended. I was very proud of the youth in running both of these programs and this is what we want them to do, rather than, you know, they could be in the street creating havoc but yet they were there developing their skills, leadership skills, and I'm just so proud of them, I just encourage them to continue.

Last thing, I'm just gonna put in a plug for, I'm looking for the day that we can have a district school calendar online that outlines different committee meetings, different things going on in the district, so that we don't overlap. I'm looking; maybe can that be a birthday present?

SUPERINTENDENT: I'll tie it in a bow.

STANGO: Any other Unfinished business?

RODRIGUEZ: I just wanted to acknowledge, the Bridge to Success Organization released a 100 Honorees of 100 Best Young People of Waterbury and I'm proud that they selected some fine individuals from the Waterbury School System and I'm also extremely proud to say that my daughter was one of those selected. So I wanted to give some special words tonight.

STANGO: Excellent report. Superintendent, you can make up, because you gave up your time before.

SUPERINTENDENT: I thank the Board for their patience. I just wanted to thank my guests again for all of their support with reform. Just with patience to the Board, I just want to review again reform steps, where we are with Commissioner's Network schools and just so, providing you up-to-date information. Again, we're pleased to announce that Waterbury has been selected by the Connecticut State Department of Education to submit Turnaround Plan applications for Walsh Elementary and Crosby High School for final selection in the Commissioner's Network beginning 2013, 2014. I just want to read quickly, the initial selection was based upon the district's Expression of Interest form submitted to the State Department, in the letter notifying about Walsh and Crosby, the Commissioner stated "by virtue of your interest in the Network, the initial demonstration of your district's commitment and capacity to implement transformative changes and the significant academic and developmental needs of the students at Crosby and Walsh Elementary School". So they believe we are a strong candidate for both, as a pathway approach, and I just wanted the Board to be aware of the next steps because there really truly is a time sensitive timeline and plan that needs to happen. The district must convene a School Turnaround Committee for each school with membership that confirms to State statute, that should say "conform" by the way, not confirm. The district

must prepare for an operations and instructional audit to be conducted by the State Department of Education in conjunction with the local board of education, the School Governance Council, and the Turnaround Committees. And as part of those preparations the district must complete and update a chart called a Commissioner's Network Sub-inventory for each school by February 8, 2013, which is Friday; we received this Tuesday. We're getting it done; we got a great team working on it. And the operations and instructional audit for Walsh, this is very important to note, the operations and instructional audit for Walsh Elementary School from the State Department will be scheduled for February 13 and 14 and the operations and instructional audit for Crosby High School has been scheduled for February 25 and 26. Lastly, I need to note that on Wednesday, February 13, the Chief Turnaround Officer, Debra Kurshan and staff from the State Department of Education will be meeting with Central Office and School Governance Councils from Walsh and Crosby at Waterbury Arts Magnet School beginning at 6 o'clock. I think Walsh is at six and Crosby will be at seven. So I just wanted to note that. I do have a timeline for you that I will update and send out to you but I think it's important that the Board needs to act on the Turnaround Committees and we need to complete our audit and there's another informational meeting next week.

BROWN: Do Board members have an official role or are we just gonna be listening to the results of these meetings?

SUPERINTENDENT: You have an official role as a Board to select members for the Turnaround Committee. As far as the visits next week, certainly, I'm a guest as well; the State Department is just answering questions with regards to the Governance Council, any staff that may have questions.

BROWN: So we help select the members for the Turnaround Committee?

SUPERINTENDENT: Yes.

BROWN: And how is that gonna happen?

SUPERINTENDENT: Well, we will need to talk to the President about how that process will proceed. If you want it to begin at Ad-hoc Reform, if you wanted to do full committee, take nominations, but we certainly need to work those details out.

BROWN: Okay, thank you.

STANGO: When does that have to be done Superintendent?

SUPERINTENDENT: As soon as possible.

STANGO: Yesterday?

SUPERINTENDENT: Yesterday, absolutely. The sooner the better they have stated to us. But they know we are working on it.

GUIDONE: That Friday, February 8 date, we better try to get it done on Thursday.

SUPERINTENDENT: But I would encourage all students to continue to do their homework; the Superintendent will not make that call this early yet.

STANGO: Any other questions for the Superintendent?

HARVEY: Superintendent, February 13 and 14 for Walsh, 25 and 26, and then the 13<sup>th</sup> the Center for what...

SUPERINTENDENT: Let me clarify this again. I'll send you a timeline on that. The audit from the State Department, the Operations and Instructional Audit for Walsh will be scheduled for February 13 and 14 and for Crosby will be February 25 and 26. I believe I sent that out to all of you today electronically. Next week, Wednesday, February 13, the Chief Turnaround Officer from the State will have another informational workshop for the Governance Councils. Just as a courtesy to them not running between facilities we're housing it here.

HARVEY: Can Board members attend?

SUPERINTENDENT: Absolutely.

### ***ADJOURNMENT***

**Upon a motion by Commissioner Sweeney and duly seconded by Commissioner Hayes, it was voted unanimously to adjourn at 8:25 p.m.**

ATTEST: \_\_\_\_\_  
Carrie A. Swain, Clerk  
*Board of Education*