



Board of Education Regular Meeting Agenda
501 Kings Highway East, 2nd Floor Board Conference Room
January 9, 2018
7:00 PM

1. Call to Order of the Regular Meeting of the Board of Education and Roll Call
2. Pledge of Allegiance
3. Student Reports
Fairfield Ludlow: Ms. Molly Baker, Ms. Isabella Schichter
Fairfield Warde: Mr. Ted Orben, Mr. Paul Rivera
4. Public Comment*
5. Presentation of the Superintendent's Proposed 2018-2019 Operating Budget, Dr. Jones
(Limited Hard Copy Distribution. Posted to the website on January 10, 2018)
6. Old Business
 - A. Approval of 2018-2019 BOE Capital Projects
Recommended Motion: "that the Board of Education approve the 2018-2019 Capital Projects"
 - B. Approval of 2018-2019 BOE Capital Non-Recurring Projects
Recommended Motion: "that the Board of Education approve the 2018-2019 *Capital Non-Recurring* Projects"
7. New Business
 - A. Approval of the Collective Bargaining Agreement between the Fairfield Educational Association and Fairfield Public Schools for the period July 1, 2018 through June 30, 2021
Recommended Motion: "that the Board of Education approve the Collective Bargaining Agreement between the Fairfield Educational Association and Fairfield Public Schools for the period July 1, 2018 through June 30, 2021"
8. Approval of Minutes
 - A. Approval of Regular Minutes of December 12, 2017
Recommended Motion: "that the Board of Education approve the minutes of the Regular Meeting of December 12, 2017"
(Enclosure No. 1)
 - B. Approval of Special Minutes of December 14, 2017
Recommended Motion: "that the Board of Education approve the minutes of the Special Meeting of December 14, 2017"
(Enclosure No. 2)
9. Superintendent's Report
 - A. PSAT and SAT Scores Chart
(Enclosure No. 3)

10. Committee/Liaison Reports
11. Open Board Comment
12. Public Comment*
13. Adjournment

Recommended Motion: “that this Regular Meeting of the Board of Education adjourn”

**During this period the Board will accept public comment on items pertaining to this meeting’s agenda from any citizen present at the meeting (per BOE By-Law, Article V, Section 6). Those wishing to videotape or take photographs must abide by CGS §1-226.*

CALENDAR OF EVENTS

January 16, 2018, Special Budget Discussion	Board of Education 7:30 PM	501 Kings Highway East 2 nd Floor Board Conference Room
--	-------------------------------	---

RELOCATION POLICY NOTICE

The Fairfield Public Schools System provides services to ensure students, parents and other persons have access to meetings, programs and activities. The School System will relocate programs in order to ensure accessibility of programs and activities to disabled persons. To make arrangements, please contact the office of Special Education, 501 Kings Highway East, Fairfield, CT 06825, Telephone: (203) 255-8379.

DRAFT

**Regular Meeting Minutes
Fairfield BoE, December 12, 2017**

NOTICE: A full meeting recording can be obtained from Fairfield Public Schools. Please call 203-255-8371 for more information and/or see the FPS website (under Board Meeting Minutes) for a link to FAIRTV.

Call to Order of the Regular Meeting of the Board of Education and Roll Call

Chairman Philip Dwyer called the Regular meeting to order at 7:32PM. Present were members Trisha Pytko, Jennifer Leeper, Christine Vitale, Jessica Gerber, Philip Dwyer, Jennifer Jacobsen, Jennifer Maxon-Kennelly, Nick Aysseh and Jeff Peterson. Others present were Superintendent Dr. Toni Jones, FLHS student representatives Molly Baker and Isabella Schichter, FWHS student representatives Ted Orben and Paul Rivera, members of the central office leadership team, and approximately 20 members of the public.

Voting Summary:

Approval of Holland Hill Plans and Specifications

Mr. Aysseh moved/Mrs. Gerber seconded the recommended motion “that the Board of Education approve the Holland Hill Plans and Specifications” **Motion passed 9-0.**

Discussion and Possible Action on Bylaw Change

Mrs. Gerber moved/Mrs. Maxon-Kennelly seconded the recommended motion “that the Board of Education approve the bylaw change for Article II Section 3C as enclosed” **Motion passed 9-0.**

Approval of Special Minutes of November 28, 2017

Mrs. Gerber moved/Mrs. Jacobsen seconded the recommended motion “that the Board of Education approve the minutes of the Special Meeting of November 28, 2017” **Motion passed 9-0.**

Approval of Organizational Minutes of November 28, 2017

Mrs. Gerber moved/Mr. Aysseh seconded the recommended motion “that the Board of Education approve the minutes of the Organizational Meeting of November 28, 2017” **Motion passed 9-0.**

Approval of Regular Minutes of November 28, 2017

Mrs. Gerber moved/Ms. Pytko seconded the recommended motion “that the Board of Education approve the minutes of the Regular Meeting of November 28, 2017” **Motion passed 9-0.**

Approval of Special Minutes of December 6, 2017

Mrs. Gerber moved/Mrs. Vitale seconded the recommended motion “that the Board of Education approve the minutes of the Special Meeting of December 6, 2017” **Motion passed 9-0.**

Adjournment

Mrs. Gerber moved/Ms. Pytko seconded the recommended motion “that this Regular Meeting of the Board of Education adjourn.” **Motion passed 9-0.** Meeting adjourned at 10:25PM

Detailed Minutes:

Student Reports

Mr. Orben and Mr. Rivera reported for FWHS: Looking forward to Carillon concerts; Warde hosted the District Leadership Team for a walk-through of 36 classrooms; winter sports are beginning including basketball and skiing; the courtyard pink-out poster is displayed in the hallways.

Ms. Baker and Ms. Schichter reported for FLHS: the Blood Drive was very successful; the Candlelight concerts take place next week; the NEASC school evaluation survey is underway; the winter sport pep rally takes place this week; AP Gov

DRAFT

students video-chatted with Tommy Vietore (former US National Security Council spokesperson); also hosted career day last week.

PTA Delegates

Mrs. Gerber introduced the BOE PTA representatives who were in attendance: Jill Vergara and Linda Erickson from Sherman, Ria Mehta from Dwight, Kelly Jacobsen from Mill Hill, Kelly McWhinnie from NSS, and Bonnie Rotelli from SEPTA. Mr. Dwyer thanked all for their participation.

New Business

Approval of Holland Hill Plans and Specifications

Mr. Aysseh moved, Mrs. Gerber seconded that the Board of Education approve the Holland Hill Plans and Specifications.

Mr. Dwyer reviewed the project history. Mrs. Gerber added that the vote is really a technicality for the state, nothing in the ed specs has changed. Mr. Tom Quinn, Holland Hill Building Committee (HHBC) Chairman and Bill Manderville, Vice-Chair, agreed. The project cost is \$18.5M with \$500K reserved for unforeseen remediation. The \$500K will not be bonded.

Motion Passed: 9-0

Health Insurance Projections

Mrs. Munsell, Executive Director Finance and Business Services, introduced AON representatives Mr. Lindgren and Mr. Chamberlain. Mr. Lindgren compared the self-insured Cigna Plan with the current State 2.0 Plan. Previous Cigna claims were projected forward to simulate costs. Using the State Plan as adopted on October 1, 2017, the comparison showed a savings of \$5M. The district did not have the option to adopt changes to the State Plan earlier than October 1, 2017. He also noted that dental benefits can be complicated to separate out. Mr. Chamberlain said a wellness component with preventive care requirements includes dental and is easier to track through the State Plan.

Mrs. Maxon-Kennelly asked if the employees had premium impacts. Mr. Lindgren said yes; he also reviewed overall state participation of the Plan with the 10/1 changes. Mr. Dwyer added that the district had one week to decide. The Superintendent worked quickly to review the changes with union leadership. Mr. Lindgren said the projected costs for 17-18 will be significantly lower than the 15-16 costs.

High School Academic Expectations

Mr. Cummings, Mr. Hatzis and Mr. Ebling reviewed the High School Academic Expectations, which reflect 21st century skills, guide instruction and assessment, are met through successful implementation of curriculum and help to accomplish NEASC accreditation. The Expectations address (1) how students will demonstrate critical and creative thinking to effectively evaluate evidence and construct solutions, and (2) how students will communicate information clearly and effectively in a variety of contexts and work collaboratively to solve problems. Additionally, Mr. Cummings said the district is actively involved with 18 other districts, working to develop the portrait of a graduate.

Student representatives asked, when will the new graduation requirements take effect? Has the computer proficiency exam been eliminated? Mr. Hatzis said new graduation requirements will take effect with the class of 2023 - today's 7th graders. Mr. Cummings said the computer proficiency exam will no longer be required under the new guidelines.

Ms. Pytko asked where the district was in the NEASC process. Mr. Hatzis said Ludlowe falls under the older NEASC guidelines; the NEASC visit takes place in March 2019. Step 1 is self-study analysis using the Endicott Survey. Mr. Ebling said Warde falls under the new NEASC 2020 guidelines. The initial NEASC visit takes place in October 2018. Priority

DRAFT

areas will be reviewed. Students and faculty have completed a survey and parents will have a different survey. A full visit takes place in 2020 to review progress. This is more aligned to school improvement planning.

Mrs. Jacobsen: Might there be a change in PE credits? Mr. Hatzis said the requirement of 1 credit remains the same, however, the definition has been expanded to wellness – with opportunities to explore other options. The idea is to look at multiple pathways for students to graduate which may include online or distance learning. Ms. Pytko asked if that includes the option to play a sport instead of take a gym class. Mr. Cummings said it is not yet defined.

Mrs. Leeper asked several questions regarding the accreditation process, realistic achievements, grades vs. skills, and how the profile of a graduate is measured. Mr. Ebling said a rubric is used to assist faculty with standards and ratings. Mr. Hatzis added that 9th and 10th graders will be assessed on standards of curriculum for those grade levels. Teachers will provide feedback on acquiring skills. Mr. Cummings said as students acquire skills, the rubric will be changed or replaced over time.

Mrs. Gerber: Will the portrait of a graduate involve stakeholder groups? Mr. Cummings said this is still being developed, but the idea is to set aside a meeting time to invite some aspect of the community.

Mrs. Vitale: Is it possible that students may have a skillset in one discipline and not another? Mr. Ebling said yes. Dr. Jones added that the work is exciting because the state has opened the door to new possibilities without huge cost implications.

Mrs. Maxon-Kennelly noticed the content vs. skills in the rubric and expressed some concern that content might be let go. Mr. Ebling said skills are taught through the content. Mr. Hatzis added that the teachers will report an accumulated grade with a standards-based approach. There will be many opportunities for proficiency. Mr. Cummings said the state has not provided much time to complete the work for the class of 2023, but the plan is to work with the Policy Committee and present to the Board in June 2018.

Proposed Capital Project Requests 2018-2019

Mr. Cullen presented the Capital Project Requests for 2018-2019.

(1) The Sherman Elementary Phase III Renovation and Addition: \$3.2M; the cost number must not exceed the amount calculated under the FEMA regulation of 50% of the value of the property for improvements due to the close proximity to a major watercourse. This is the final phase of the project and was previously in the waterfall as \$3M. Adding a bus loop and parent pick-up has increased the amount to \$3.2M. However, the FEMA regulation has exceptions such as architectural engineering fees, lockers and tech upgrades; bringing the FEMA number closer to \$2.5M.

In response to Board questions, Mr. Cullen added the following:

- a. Would recommend this project use the Special Projects Building Committee.
- b. Is concerned about the roof structure being strong enough to support the air conditioning piece. Could change this to a maintenance issue, or could possibly have a Sherman Phase IV, if problems are encountered.
- c. \$180K will remove the stage and make the APR larger to allow for increased seating.
- d. Lockers are rusted through and cannot be re-purposed.

(2) The Mill Hill Elementary School Renovation and Addition Project Team Initial Funding: \$1.5M. Mill Hill is in need of a partial renovation and new addition to meet the capacity deficiencies, enrollment needs and elimination of five portable classrooms. Existing portables need to be moved during construction.

DRAFT

The Board commented on the most recent 10-year enrollment projections and the impact on this project. Mrs. Gerber asked for a presentation on enrollment projections.

Mr. Cullen responded to Board questions and comments:

- a. Portables could be moved to various places; two of them may not be needed at all. It was mentioned that portables were included in the Holland Hill project as well, and there were Board questions regarding the differences between the costs of the HH and MH seed money requests.
- b. The Board will decide on the size of the addition. If the Board continues with the 504 addition, the price of the project may jump from what is currently in the waterfall at \$18M, to \$25M; due to past experience with Holland Hill and Riverfield. The site is small and difficult – there is a ledge. Dr. Jones agreed and added that Mill Hill is a small school – a project based on a 504 will be a very large addition. Mr. Dwyer asked whether building a larger project could impact reimbursement. Mr. Cullen said the state will let us know if we are building too big. The highest projected enrollment for Mill Hill in the next 10 years is 384.

Mr. Dwyer said this will be a January action item. As projects cost more or less, the Finance Department works together with the Town during the fall Capital Planning Summit to balance out the waterfall with other projects.

Proposed Capital Non-Recurring Projects 2018-2019

Mr. Cullen said the 4 projects total just under \$2M and include: Security Infrastructure Upgrades, I.T. CAT 6 Electrical Project, FLHS Student Parking Lot Replacement and I.T. Switch Replacement Project.

- (1) The Security Infrastructure Project (\$345K) will enhance security and safety for staff and students. It covers intrusion panels as well as other improvements that cannot be shared with the public.
- (2) The I.T CAT 6 Electrical Project (\$200K) is for low voltage cabling and additional dual outlet/quad at secondary schools. Ms. Byrnes added that this allows projectors to be accessed remotely.
- (3) The FLHS Parking Lot Replacement Project (\$275K) is badly needed and was not approved by the BOS last year. The parking lot is in very poor shape and the solar carport does not impact this project. Once complete, it will have a new sub-base and should last 20 years.

Mr. Aysseh expressed some concern regarding drainage issues with the carports. He also asked about paving the side road that abuts Carolton. Mr. Cullen said the carport has some drainage issues on the sidewalks. The Carolton Hospital will re-pave the side road after construction on their end is complete.

Mrs. Gerber confirmed with Mr. Cullen that this project will not conflict with the summer window installation. Mrs. Gerber also noted that each time this project gets pushed to the next year, it becomes more expensive. Mr. Dwyer agreed and said the BOE needs to advocate for this project.

- (4) The I.T. Switch Replacement Project (\$972K) is a larger project that will occur in 2 phases and will migrate the Ethernet switches in the high schools, WFC and Central Office. Ms. Byrnes said the \$1.55M is the actual amount without the Erate federal grant (as on page 20). Mr. Cullen said the Town bonds the projects.

Discussion and Possible Action on Bylaw Change

Mrs. Gerber moved, Mrs. Maxon-Kennelly seconded that the Board of Education approve the Bylaw change for Article II Section 3C as enclosed.

Mrs. Gerber said the minutes were easier to read prior to 2013 and she hopes the Board supports the motion.

Mr. Dwyer advocated to stay closely aligned with Roberts Rules. He fully supports this motion and hopes for more

DRAFT

concise minutes.

Motion passed 9-0.

Approval of Minutes

Approval of Special Minutes of November 28, 2017

Mrs. Gerber moved, Mrs. Jacobsen seconded that the Board of Education approve the minutes of the Special Meeting of November 28, 2017. **Motion passed 9-0.**

Approval of Organizational Minutes of November 28, 2017

Mrs. Gerber moved, Mr. Aysseh seconded that the Board of Education approve the minutes of the Organizational Meeting of November 28, 2017. **Motion passed 9-0.**

Approval of Regular Minutes of November 28, 2017

Mrs. Gerber moved, Ms. Pytko seconded that the Board of Education approve the minutes of the Regular Meeting of November 28, 2017. **Motion passed 9-0.**

Approval of Special Minutes of December 6, 2017

Mrs. Gerber moved, Mrs. Vitale seconded that the Board of Education approve the minutes of the Special Meeting of December 6, 2017. **Motion passed 9-0.**

Superintendent Report

Dr. Jones said she is looking forward to attending the high school concerts. She attended the McKinley concert, Riverfield's Shark Tank, visited the Bella Boutique, watched the Warde TV show, and previewed Dwight's new 5th grade show.

The 15-16 District Profile Report is online.

Committee/Liaison Report:

Ms. Pytko reported for SEPTA. The cookie walk and Holiday Party will take place on December 20.

Mrs. Gerber reported for the OHSBC. It is expected that this committee will be disbanded at the BOS meeting.

Ms. Leeper reported for the RTM. The Administrator Contract was presented last night.

Open Board Comment:

Ms. Pytko noted that she is unable to attend the upcoming Town Hall on December 14.

Mr. Dwyer said the 2018 BOE meeting date schedule is official and will be posted with the Town Clerk. Liaison and committee assignments have also been completed.

Mrs. Maxon-Kennelly and Mr. Dwyer encouraged the public to attend the BOE Town Hall on December 14 at 7:30.

Adjournment

Mrs. Gerber moved, Ms. Pytko seconded that this Regular Meeting of the Board of Education adjourn.

Motion passed 9-0. Meeting adjourned at 10:25PM

*Respectfully Submitted
Jessica Gerber
Secretary, Fairfield BOE*

Special Meeting Minutes
Fairfield BoE; December 14, 2017

Call to order of the Special Meeting of the Board of Education and Roll Call

Chairman Philip Dwyer called the Special meeting to order at 7:31PM. Present were members Jennifer Leeper, Christine Vitale, Jessica Gerber, Philip Dwyer, Jennifer Jacobsen, Nick Aysseh (arrived 7:50PM), Jennifer Maxon-Kennelly and Jeff Peterson. Trisha Pytko was absent. Others present were RTM member Pamela Iacono and approximately 15 members of the public.

Mr. Dwyer thanked the public for attending and gave a brief synopsis of what topics the town hall meetings would cover. He welcomed former BoE Chair and current RTM member Pamela Iacono, who would act as moderator of the meeting, allowing Mr. Dwyer to participate more freely.

Ms. Iacono thanked the Board and members of the public. She asked members of the public to indicate how many people were planning on speaking.

Tina Brown 35 Quaker Lane, FLHS teacher. First question is regarding math levels in the HS. There used to be more levels. She had told the previous math curriculum leader that the new/current setup left some students in a difficult position and asked if there could be consideration to creating a new class that would teach Algebra 1 every day. It would help students with their self-esteem and their achievement and understanding of the material. Ms. Leeper said that she heard what she was saying. She asked Ms. Brown's thoughts regarding middle school preparation. Ms. Brown said that students' cognitive development varies, and opportunities to repeat pre-Algebra do not exist, and the Algebra 1 summer program is abbreviated. Mrs. Maxon-Kennelly said that this would be an internal decision regarding staff allocation. She does think it's an interesting idea, an easy thing to prove a need for. She supports the notion. Mr. Dwyer said that the concept is supporting students' individual needs. Said that the idea of levels is one that has been discussed and that he defers to staff to present new ideas to the Board. It is not an easy process to add new/additional staff. Ms. Brown said that having a full year Algebra 1 course might not result in additional staff. Mr. Peterson asked if Ms. Brown was talking about full 85-minute classes every day; Ms. Brown confirmed this and said that another district did this already; it is not a new idea. Ms. Brown also remarked on the Milone & McBroom presentation and questioned how Fairfield had fewer/smaller buildings in the 70s when there were more children than now – how does that make sense. Mrs. Vitale

DRAFT

said that she imagined that class sizes played a role in this. Mrs. Maxon-Kennelly said that she thought class sizes were a factor, and perhaps also the additional spaces now needed in elementary school for additional services that the district now provides. She doesn't believe that space issues exist in MS and HS. Mr. Dwyer said he agrees with Mrs. Maxon-Kennelly, and said that he also believes that the subject opportunities for students today is much wider than it was in the 70s.

Bob Smoler, teacher in Fairfield. Question is regarding the operational effectiveness committee's disbandment. There will be hard decisions that need to be made. We will either need to raise revenues or cut services on the town or school side. Is curious as to how prioritization will take place. Will there be guiding principles? Mrs. Gerber said that there is talk of setting up a finance and/or facilities standing committee. They will work and gather feedback from the public before presenting to the full Board. She supports the bylaw change necessary to create a committee. Mr. Smoler asked about the priorities or charge of the committee. Mrs. Gerber said that the wording of the bylaw could address that, or the committee itself could come up with them at their first meeting. Mr. Aysseh said that bringing back the finance committee would involve that group working directly with the Superintendent. He thinks that the committee would look at the topics covered in the discussions regarding operational effectiveness. School space and facilities issues might need to be dealt with on an ad hoc basis. Standing finance committee can do reconnaissance to then bring to the board. Mr. Smoler said that the frustration that people who work in the district feel is that there aren't ideas presented for people to bounce things off. Said that he doesn't believe anyone moves to Fairfield because we have 11 elementary schools, 3 middle schools and 2 high schools; he thinks they come here because of the overall quality of the district and its programs. Wonders if we have a truly long range plan taking us out 30-50 years. What do we want the district to look like? Some of our buildings are getting very old. We need a longer range plan.

Lauren Bove, 25 Quaker Lane. Agrees about helping out students who fall behind in middle school math. It's very important and she hopes it can be addressed. From a parent's perspective it's a real thing

John Whaley, 45 Hackley Street, Bridgeport. Read a prepared speech. He is an English teacher. He spoke to the problem of grades and how that's what students focus on, not the deeper meanings of education. Students are defined by a number. It's antithetical to the mission of FPS. Grades need to go and we need more authentic learning. Private schools and some colleges have gotten rid of grades. We need to refocus how we

DRAFT

evaluate students. Students who struggle in English and math may excel in other subjects. Authenticity is crucial to understanding. We shouldn't value product over process. Grades hinder even our brightest students from risk taking. Children are not data; we are a community of unique learners. Even our highest achievers are at a disadvantage due to the stress they feel. GPAs allow academic tracking. Begs the BoE to advocate for change. Mr. Dwyer asked Mr. Whaley to send his speech to the Superintendent's office to send to the Board. He believes that we live in a world that is obsessed with grades and numbers. If we were to go to an ungraded system we would be outliers and many people would object. This isn't the first time this topic has come up, but he believes that it will take some time for buy-in. He doubts that many Board members in CT would lead the charge. Mr. Whaley believes that we as a system should want to lead the way. Perhaps our scores would go up, not down. Mrs. Jacobsen said that she hears what he is saying but she has read many things that disagree with his perspective. This is not the world today that we exist in. Colleges want standardized test scores. Fairfield cannot afford to be a lab, it is a huge risk. She suggests we first change federal and state law. Mr. Peterson agrees with Mrs. Jacobsen that this is a big ask. Many peoples' abilities are not reflected in report cards. This plays into the notion of a long-range plan for the direction of our district. Mrs. Vitale says she doesn't think it has to be an either/or. We could try to reduce some testing but not do away with it completely. Maybe we could start small. Mrs. Gerber said that she imagined that the members of the other town bodies who approve the school budget would have an issue with doing away with grades. Such a major sea change could have very negative ramifications and she is unwilling to risk that. Mr. Whaley said he knows that major changes can't happen but wants to plant the seed of an idea. Mrs. Maxon-Kennelly said that her own daughter has spoken to being burned out with the college process. There are small ways to change things. There's a lot of work to be done. She recently went to a presentation on quality schools where mastery is stressed, and students get an A, a B or an incomplete. It was an interesting concept. Appreciated Mr. Whaley's speech.

Frank Sahagian 20 Chelsea Street, Fairfield. Spoke to teacher assessment process. Used to be in private sector work, has taught for 8 years. In his old job he did a lot of performance evaluation. He understands metrics and data. Regarding a presentation at a BoE meeting a few weeks ago – teachers have issues with data analysis. He understands the need for data but you can't easily measure some things that teachers do. The state has put forward parameters and he understands that, but he hopes there's some way to advocate for change. Assessments that were created to assess teachers are worth 45% of teachers' grades. Parent feedback is

DRAFT

insulting to him as a teacher, since it is rarely positive. He would prefer "parent communication". "Whole school indicators at 5% is a waste. Students know that the test scores don't count towards their grades, and yet this is how teachers are assessed. This is insanity. ProTrax is cumbersome and takes so much time. We have so many administrators because we have so many assessments. Teachers' goals center too much on growth. We should focus on anecdotal feedback. Ask teachers if the process is improving their work and helping students. Performance evaluations that discourage the people being evaluated are bad. If we continue to focus on data it won't help. His performance evaluation was 12 pages long and was meaningless to him. He asks that the Board look into making some sort of changes to the evaluation process. Can it be simplified? Mr. Dwyer said that the Board cannot tell the state of CT that we can't do this. Can we adjust it? We have very little latitude. All we could do is tell all of the administrators to fake the reports, which is not in the least bit a valid plan. We need to advocate on the state level, with the state reps and state senators. Mrs. Jacobsen said that it is an unfunded mandate. Perhaps with other Boards in the state we can advocate together and present new ideas to policy makers. Mr. Dwyer said he wanted to address the idea that we have administrators solely to do evaluations. Since the evaluation plan has been instituted we haven't added a single administrator. Mrs. Maxon-Kennelly said that a group of teachers have been involved in the Board's approval process of the plan parameters. She asked if the teacher committee could initiate any possible changes or adjustments to the plan. If that's possible she suggested that the teacher committee work on suggested changes. Re: anecdotal information – what has Mr. Sahagian heard or experienced in the district that has helped with his work as a teacher. Mr. Sahagian mentioned professional development where teachers teach teachers. This has been very valuable over the last two years, and it doesn't cost anything. Surveys aren't good ways to get information. Teaching is an art, not a science, which is why anecdotal info is helpful. Teachers don't have the time they need. 90% of faculty meetings are a waste of time. SPED is a big challenge – teachers are leaving in droves, their work is almost impossible. Perhaps Tuesday faculty meetings should instead be teachers working with SPED teachers. Teachers don't waste time because they don't have any time to spare.

Lynn Levesque SPED teacher started teaching in Fairfield in 1985. Understands that parents move to Fairfield because of the quality of our SPED program. McKinley School's caseloads have grown but resources have not. This year has been very challenging. Teachers are struggling to meet their educational obligations. They are an experienced hardworking team who love teaching but are working constantly with no breaks.

DRAFT

Administrators have heard their requests for help but say that there's no way to increase funding. How can we adhere to a static budgeting process when changes occur throughout the school year. Mr. Dwyer said that these concerns were mentioned during recent negotiating sessions and there is a firm commitment to working on this issue in the foreseeable future. The Board has shown a commitment to meet the needs of the SPED community. He looks forward to seeing the work of Dr. Jones and the new SPED Director. Ms. said that she is happy that long range plans may be in place but wants to know what can be done this year. Mr. Aysseh thanked the SPED team for their work and said that this is something worth looking at and discussing with the Superintendent. Mr. Dwyer said that the Board approves a budget in January for expenses that won't begin until 6-18 months in the future. The only time we can find extra money is when we shave costs from another need, but that is just a short-term fix and not ideal. Mrs. Vitale asked about students opting in, and it was explained that students come to McKinley but the resources didn't follow them. Mr. Dwyer said that the opt-in program doesn't help with the racial imbalance situation but it does help improve individual students' needs. Mrs. Vitale said that students' resources should follow them to a new school; maybe there's an issue there that we can learn more about. Ms said that the teachers at McKinley are particularly experienced, which makes it a more attractive to some parents. Mrs. Maxon-Kennelly said that it should be pointed out that students' IEPs must be adhered to. She did clarify that the Board does not make the decisions of reallocating funds during the course of the school year; that is administrative.

Sally Connolly 682 Tunxis Hill Road, asked about adding or shifting SPED resources once the school year began. Mrs. Maxon-Kennelly said that paras are assigned by IEPs, assumes there are different issues at different buildings. Thought there was a contract component to class loads. Mr. Dwyer said that there isn't a contract component to class sizes or class loads for SPED. There are ongoing discussions on this, to look for developing guidelines. Mrs. Connolly mentioned a post on Moms of Fairfield Facebook page regarding the Whitsons food service survey. People were unhappy with the way the survey was structured. There was some discontent regarding Whitsons handling of allergies. There was an expectation of a healthier food focus. She thinks it would be beneficial to get feedback from parents whose children don't get hot lunch for a reason, She asked when the contract with Whitsons ends. Hopes there are ways to address allergy community and general community, especially those who don't have children using it. Mr. Aysseh asked if she likes the idea of a survey if it's done properly. Mrs. Connolly said that she was encouraged to reach out to Whitsons and she did but didn't get a response.

DRAFT

Closing Remarks

Mr. Dwyer – said that many topics of educational interest were brought up tonight. Thanked the public for attending. Thanked Mrs. lacono for moderating.

Adjournment

Mrs. Gerber moved/Ms. Maxon-Kennelly seconded the recommended motion “that this Special Meeting of the Board of Education adjourn.” Motion passed 8-0. Meeting adjourned at 9:10PM

2015-2016 and 2016-2017 PSAT & SAT Data Analysis

In 2015-2016, the College Board revised the PSAT & SAT to new college and career expectations. From this revision of the suite of assessments, College Board set benchmark scores based on a 75% probability of obtaining a C or better in an entry level English or mathematics course upon entering college (see <https://collegereadiness.collegeboard.org/pdf/educator-benchmark-brief.pdf>).

The content on the PSAT & SAT is the same. Ultimately, the PSAT is a practice SAT administered to students in the fall of grades 10 and 11. The PSAT and SAT consists of two different subtests: Evidenced-Based Reading and Writing (EBRW), and Mathematics. Because the PSAT and SAT are the same, the scaled scores for both sections of the assessments can be interpreted the same. For example, a 500 on the PSAT EBRW is the same as a 500 on the SAT EBRW. The College Board expects different levels of performance on the PSAT and SAT based on the specific grade the student is enrolled (see table below). For example, in mathematics the benchmark score is 480 on the 10th grade PSAT, then 510 on the 11th grade PSAT. This moving benchmark expects student achievement in increase based upon the learning that occurs over the multiple grades and assessments.

Assessment	Grade	EBRW	Mathematics
PSAT	10	430	480
	11	460	510
SAT	11	480	530

During the 2015-2016 school year, the Connecticut Board of Education adopted the SAT as the statewide assessment for accountability. The tables below illustrate the student achievement performance from Fairfield Public Schools (FPS), along with Fairfield Ludlowe High School (FLHS), and Fairfield Warde High School (FWHS) for two years of administration of the PSAT & SAT.

Math PSAT Data:

10 th Grade PSAT				
District/School	Indicator	2015-2016	2016-2017	Change
FPS	Average Scaled Score	490	500	+10
	Percent Meeting Benchmark	55%	62%	+7%
FLHS	Average Scaled Score	494	511	+17
	Percent Meeting Benchmark	54%	69%	+15%
FWHS	Average Scaled Score	486	490	+4
	Percent Meeting Benchmark	52%	55%	+3%

11 th Grade PSAT				
District/School	Indicator	2015-2016	2016-2017	Change
FPS	Average Scaled Score	519	527	+8
	Percent Meeting Benchmark	52%	63%	+9%
FLHS	Average Scaled Score	527	526	-1
	Percent Meeting Benchmark	55%	64%	+9%
FWHS	Average Scaled Score	511	528	+17
	Percent Meeting Benchmark	49%	62%	+13%

10 th to 11 th Grade PSAT Cohort				
District/School	Indicator	2015-2016 10 th Grade	2016-2017 11 th Grade	Change
FPS	Average Scaled Score	490	527	+37
	Percent Meeting Benchmark	55%	63%	+8%
FLHS	Average Scaled Score	494	526	+32
	Percent Meeting Benchmark	54%	64%	+10%
FWHS	Average Scaled Score	486	528	+42
	Percent Meeting Benchmark	52%	62%	+10%

Note: Expected Growth from PSAT 10 to PSAT 11 is 30 Scaled Score points. See <https://collegereadiness.collegeboard.org/about/scores/benchmarks> for benchmarks.

Math SAT Data

11 th Grade SAT				
District/School	Indicator	2015-2016	2016-2017	Change
FPS	Average Scaled Score	557	558	+1
	Percent Meeting Benchmark	63%	63%	+0%
FLHS	Average Scaled Score	570	564	-6
	Percent Meeting Benchmark	70%	65%	-5%
FWHS	Average Scaled Score	548	557	+9
	Percent Meeting Benchmark	59%	63%	+4%

11 th Grade SAT District Comparison				
District/School	Indicator	2015-2016	2016-2017	Change
Fairfield	Average Scaled Score	557	558	+1
	Percent Meeting Benchmark	63%	63%	+0%
Trumbull	Average Scaled Score	557	569	+12
	Percent Meeting Benchmark	58%	64%	+6%
Greenwich	Average Scaled Score	575	570	-5
	Percent Meeting Benchmark	64%	62%	-2%
West Hartford	Average Scaled Score	545	557	+12
	Percent Meeting Benchmark	56%	61%	+5%
Westport	Average Scaled Score	599	609	+10
	Percent Meeting Benchmark	76%	78%	+2%

Math PSAT & SAT Cohort

11th Grade PSAT and 11th Grade SAT				
District/School	Indicator	2015-2016 11 th PSAT	2015-2016 11 th SAT	Change PSAT 10 to SAT 11
FPS	Average Scaled Score	519	557	+38
	Percent Meeting Benchmark	52%	63%	+11%
FLHS	Average Scaled Score	527	570	+43
	Percent Meeting Benchmark	55%	70%	+15%
FWHS	Average Scaled Score	511	548	+37
	Percent Meeting Benchmark	49%	59%	+10%

Note: Expected Growth from PSAT 11 to SAT 11 is 20 Scaled Score points. See <https://collegereadiness.collegeboard.org/about/scores/benchmarks> for benchmarks.

10th & 11th Grade PSAT and 11th Grade SAT						
District/School	Indicator	2015- 2016 10 th PSAT	2016- 2017 11 th PSAT	2016- 2017 11 th SAT	Change PSAT 11 to SAT 11	Change PSAT 10 to SAT 11
FPS	Average Scaled Score	490	527	558	+31	+68
	Percent Meeting Benchmark	55%	63%	63%	+0%	+8%
FLHS	Average Scaled Score	494	526	564	+38	+70
	Percent Meeting Benchmark	54%	64%	65%	+1%	+11%
FWHS	Average Scaled Score	486	528	557	+29	+71
	Percent Meeting Benchmark	52%	62%	63%	+1%	+11%

Note: Expected Growth from PSAT 11 to SAT 11 is 20 Scaled Score points. Expected growth from PSAT 10 to SAT 11 is 50 Scaled Score points. See <https://collegereadiness.collegeboard.org/about/scores/benchmarks> for benchmarks.

Language Arts PSAT Data:

10th Grade PSAT				
District/School	Indicator	2015-2016	2016-2017	Change
FPS	Average Scaled Score	513	520	+7
	Percent Meeting Benchmark	88%	84%	-4%
FLHS	Average Scaled Score	512	532	+20
	Percent Meeting Benchmark	82%	90%	+8%
FWHS	Average Scaled Score	514	508	-6
	Percent Meeting Benchmark	85%	78%	-7%

11th Grade PSAT				
District/School	Indicator	2015-2016	2016-2017	Change
FPS	Average Scaled Score	542	550	+8
	Percent Meeting Benchmark	83%	86%	+3%
FLHS	Average Scaled Score	551	550	-1
	Percent Meeting Benchmark	87%	84%	-3%
FWHS	Average Scaled Score	533	550	+17
	Percent Meeting Benchmark	79%	86%	+7%

10th to 11th Grade PSAT Cohort				
District/School	Indicator	2015-2016 10 th Grade	2016-2017 11 th Grade	Change
FPS	Average Scaled Score	513	550	+37
	Percent Meeting Benchmark	88%	86%	-2%
FLHS	Average Scaled Score	512	550	+38
	Percent Meeting Benchmark	82%	84%	+2%
FWHS	Average Scaled Score	514	550	+36
	Percent Meeting Benchmark	85%	86%	+1%

Note: Expected Growth from PSAT 10 to PSAT 11 is 30 Scaled Score points. See <https://collegereadiness.collegeboard.org/about/scores/benchmarks> for benchmarks.

Language Arts SAT Data

11th Grade SAT				
District/School	Indicator	2015-2016	2016-2017	Change
FPS	Average Scaled Score	571	580	+9
	Percent Meeting Benchmark	84%	86%	+2%
FLHS	Average Scaled Score	580	582	+2
	Percent Meeting Benchmark	88%	86%	-2%
FWHS	Average Scaled Score	562	578	+16
	Percent Meeting Benchmark	81%	85%	+4%

11 th Grade SAT District Comparison				
District	Indicator	2015-2016	2016-2017	Change
Fairfield	Average Scaled Score	571	580	+9
	Percent Meeting Benchmark	84%	86%	+2%
Trumbull	Average Scaled Score	557	578	+19
	Percent Meeting Benchmark	82%	86%	+6%
Greenwich	Average Scaled Score	575	586	+11
	Percent Meeting Benchmark	81%	85%	+4%
West Hartford	Average Scaled Score	559	573	+14
	Percent Meeting Benchmark	77%	81%	+4%
Westport	Average Scaled Score	598	616	+18
	Percent Meeting Benchmark	91%	92%	+1%

Language Arts PSAT & SAT Cohort

11 th Grade PSAT and 11 th Grade SAT				
District/School	Indicator	2015-2016 11 th PSAT	2015-2016 11 th SAT	Change PSAT 10 to SAT 11
FPS	Average Scaled Score	550	571	+21
	Percent Meeting Benchmark	86%	84%	-2%
FLHS	Average Scaled Score	550	580	+30
	Percent Meeting Benchmark	84%	88%	+4%
FWHS	Average Scaled Score	550	562	+12
	Percent Meeting Benchmark	86%	81%	-5%

Note: Expected Growth from PSAT 11 to SAT 11 is 20 Scaled Score points. See <https://collegereadiness.collegeboard.org/about/scores/benchmarks> for benchmarks.

10 th & 11 th Grade PSAT and 11 th Grade SAT						
District/School	Indicator	2015- 2016 10 th PSAT	2016- 2017 11 th PSAT	2016- 2017 11 th SAT	Change PSAT 11 to SAT 11	Change PSAT 10 to SAT 11
FPS	Average Scaled Score	513	550	580	+30	+67
	Percent Meeting Benchmark	88%	86%	86%	+0%	-2%
FLHS	Average Scaled Score	512	550	582	+32	+70
	Percent Meeting Benchmark	82%	84%	86%	+2%	+6%
FWHS	Average Scaled Score	514	550	578	+28	+64
	Percent Meeting Benchmark	85%	86%	85%	-1%	+0%

Note: Expected Growth from PSAT 11 to SAT 11 is 20 Scaled Score points. Expected growth from PSAT 10 to SAT 11 is 50 Scaled Score points. See <https://collegereadiness.collegeboard.org/about/scores/benchmarks> for benchmarks.

Conclusions/Implications/Questions

Mathematics Analysis (*implications/conclusions/questions come from a further analysis into the various sub-scores beyond the data provided based on teacher feedback and data-team analysis*):

Positive illustrated in the data:

- Students moving through the FPS high school mathematics curricula are showing growth as illustrated on the PSAT to the SAT.
 - How effective are the instructional interventions provided by the workshop teachers on the PSAT to the SAT as they move through the specific math courses?
 - What mathematical concepts/skills are FPS doing well/struggling?
 - What intervention practices are high school teachers using to help struggling students?
 - How well does the STAR correlate to performance on the PSAT/SAT?
- The more students are enrolled in higher-level courses relates to higher overall performance on the SAT.
 - What are the enrollment patterns in future years?
 - To what extent are students “staying” with honors mathematics courses?
 - What adult actions (leadership, teacher, and counselor) can support more students in higher-level courses?
 - If more students are encouraged to take higher-level courses, will this negatively influence the overall average for each course?

Areas of Growth:

- Algebra-1 students are not performing well on tasks related to the Heart of Algebra.
 - How often are Algebra-1 students expected to complete rigorous SAT type tasks?
 - What are Geometry/Algebra-2 teachers doing to support the past Algebra-1 concepts/skills as the students move up the grades?
 - How often do Geometry/Algebra-2 teachers cycle back to support the Heart of Algebra

Language Arts/Literacy Analysis:

Positives illustrated in the data:

- Students moving through the FPS high school Language Arts/English curricula are showing growth as illustrated on the PSAT to the SAT.
 - Students are showing growth in all areas of the SAT Evidenced Based Reading and Writing sections: Command of Evidence, Words in Context, Expression of Ideas, and Standard English Conventions.

Guiding Questions

- How effective are the instructional strategies utilized by English teachers on the PSAT to the SAT as they move through the specific English courses?
 - What Literacy concepts/skills are FPS students doing well/struggling?
 - What intervention practices are high school teachers using to help struggling students?
 - How well does the STAR Reading assessment correlate to performance on the PSAT/SAT?
- The more students are enrolled in higher-level courses relates to higher overall performance on the SAT Evidenced Based Reading and Writing sections.
 - What are the enrollment patterns in future years?
 - To what extent are students “staying” with honors English courses?
 - What adult actions (leadership, teacher, and counselor) can support more students in higher-level courses?
 - If more students are encouraged to take higher-level courses, will this negatively influence the overall average for each course?

Areas of Growth:

- English 32 students are not performing as well on tasks related to Evidenced Based Reading and Writing sections as compared to students in English 31 and students in AP Language and Composition.
 - How often are English 32 students expected to complete rigorous SAT type tasks?
 - What are specific instructional practices are English 12 and English 22 teachers employing to support the Evidence Based Reading and Writing concepts/skills as the students move up the grades?