

**Special Meeting Minutes
Fairfield BoE, July 9, 2015**

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 Special Meeting of the Board of Education and Roll Call

Chairman Philip Dwyer called the Regular meeting to order at 6:36PM. Present were members Eileen Liu-McCormack (arrived 6:46PM), Marc Patten, Donna Karnal, Jessica Gerber, Philip Dwyer, John Convertito, Paul Fattibene, Jennifer Maxon-Kennelly and John Llewellyn. Others present were Superintendent Dr. David Title, Deputy Superintendent Karen Parks, members of the Central Office Leadership Team, and approximately 40 members of the public.

Mr. Dwyer mentioned a special meeting regarding redistricting will be held immediately following this meeting.

Business Items

Superintendent Evaluation

Mrs. Gerber moved, Mr. Patten seconded the that the Board of Education hereby moves to enter into Executive Session to discuss superintendent employment and performance in accordance with Connecticut General Statute CGS 1-200(6)(A).

Motion Passed: 8-0

Mrs. Liu-McCormack was not present for the vote.

The Board came out of Executive Session at 7:32PM; the Special Meeting resumed at 7:45PM.

Approval of Superintendent of Schools Contract

Mrs. Gerber moved, Mrs. Maxon-Kennelly seconded that the Fairfield Board of Education enter into a contract of employment with Dr. David G. Title as Superintendent of Schools for the period 7/1/15 through 6/30/18 on the same terms as set forth in the 2014-2017 contract, except the base salary for each year shall be as for the 2014-2015 contract year unless otherwise negotiated between the parties, and that effective July 1, 2015 the 2014-2017 contract shall be terminated and replaced by the 2015-2018 contract.

Mr. Llewellyn requested a Point of Order regarding the contract language. He said the contract discussion is untimely due to the contract language requiring placement of this item on a June agenda.

Mr. Dwyer read a statement from the BOE attorney allowing for vote and discussion of this item at this meeting.

Motion Passed: 5-4

Favor: Mr. Patten, Mrs. Gerber, Mr. Dwyer, Mr. Convertito, Mrs. Maxon-Kennelly

Oppose: Mrs. Liu-McCormack, Ms. Karnal, Mr. Fattibene, Mr. Llewellyn

Mr. Convertito moved, Mrs. Maxon-Kennelly seconded that the Fairfield Board of Education set the Superintendent's base salary for 2015-2016 at a 1.75% increase over the 2014-2015 base salary.

Motion Passed: 5-4

Favor: Mr. Patten, Mrs. Gerber, Mr. Dwyer, Mr. Convertito, Mrs. Maxon-Kennelly

Oppose: Mrs. Liu-McCormack, Ms. Karnal, Mr. Fattibene, Mr. Llewellyn

Mr. Dwyer took a moment of personal privilege to acknowledge Mr. Jim Accomando, current FLHS PTA President, for receiving the honor to serve as the National PTA President-elect. Mr. Accomando said he was proud to represent the National PTA and gave some background on the association.

Approval of Policy 4217.5 Personnel – Staff/Student Non-Fraternization

Mrs. Maxon-Kennelly moved, Ms. Karnal seconded that the Board of Education approve Policy 4217.5, Personnel – Staff/Student Non-Fraternization.

Motion Passed: 9-0

Approval of the Fairfield Educator Professional Growth Plan

Mrs. Gerber moved, Mrs. Maxon-Kennelly seconded that the Board of Education adopt the Fairfield Educator Professional Growth Plan, as approved by the CT State Department of Education.

Mrs. Leffert said Board-requested changes have been incorporated, and this is a formality for the Board to adopt the plan.

Ms. Karnal asked if the plan allows for junior-level teachers to be evaluated more closely. Mrs. Leffert said Year 1 and 2 teachers have a more rigorous observation cycle and are evaluated by building administrators.

Mrs. Liu-McCormack asked if student feedback was incorporated. Mrs. Leffert said student surveys will be incorporated in the mid-year review and will be developed in the fall. Mrs. Liu-McCormack asked about the specificity of the questions in the survey. Mrs. Leffert said questions are being developed. Mrs. Liu-McCormack said she felt that end of year feedback would be effective to see if there was impact on the mid-year questions; Mrs. Leffert said this wasn't discussed by or requested by the BoE during the discussion of the plan on April 7 and suggested that this be discussed for next year's plan, and get feedback from teachers and student to see if changes should be made to the plan.

Mr. Patten asked if the teachers felt this process was beneficial. Mrs. Leffert said the plan is a work in progress, this will be the first year that all teachers will participate; this is a huge process that administrators are spending a lot of time on.

Mr. Fattibene asked what the yellow lining represents. Mrs. Leffert said the state required yellow highlight to showcase plan changes and she also reviewed the language that the state required.

Mr. Convertito said page 72 references SBAC. Mrs. Leffert said that language will remain for now but will change the following year.

Ms. Karnal asked if the Plan now goes back to the state and was told no.

Mr. Dwyer confirmed with Mrs. Leffert that the state has been notified that the Board took final action.

Public Comment: None

Motion Passed: 9-0

Approval of the District Improvement Plan, dated July 9, 2015

Mrs. Maxon-Kennelly moved, Mr. Patten seconded that the Board of Education approve the District Improvement Plan dated July 9, 2015.

Mrs. Kennelly said the Board has carefully reviewed the Plan and has done a great deal of work; the Board takes seriously its goal of approving a District Improvement Plan.

Mr. Patten thanked the Superintendent and staff for incorporating the many requested changes.

Dr. Title said this is the Plan that is being recommended and he reviewed the changes:

1. Page 3: Update on Policy Committee Role
2. Page 4: Updated the timeline to include the administrator review process as well as inclusion of review by Dr. Lemons from the Connecticut Center of School Change to ensure Plan coherence
3. Page 8: Provided background on terminology for 'District Improvement Plan' to keep the language parallel with School Improvement Plans
4. Page 10: Language adopted by BOE
5. Page 30: Changed wording on Specific Action 2-6 per Board request
6. Page 32: Clarified and updated language for Specific Action 4-20; Specific Action 4-21 covers more general communication
7. Page 39: Updated the description of School Climate Survey to include the Domain Names and the scale

Mr. Fattibene said this is a good starting point for district improvement but there is a lot of uncertainty for the next 5 years in terms of how things go, what happens in the district, etc. Because of that, he would like to add some language in regards to the timing of possible changes and modifications that may need to be made to the plan

Mr. Fattibene moved, Ms. Karnal seconded to amend the final sentence on page 10, part 3 to insert “first half of the” after “During the.”

Ms. Karnal said she agrees with Mr. Fattibene as this allows time to make changes before the following year.

Dr. Title said the timing is not really a factor as the changes to be implemented would be for the 4th year.

Mrs. Maxon-Kennelly said much of the data wouldn’t be available until March or later; 3 full years of data is needed before making any changes and she is not in favor of the amendment.

Mr. Llewellyn said there should be time to make adjustments prior to the third year and recommended changing the wording to allow for a formal review at the end of the second year of implementation.

Mrs. Liu-McCormack questioned the difference of the annual vs. the formal review. Dr. Title said the data points would be presented each fall; the formal review would be a more in-depth mid-point formal review process where staff will be asked to look at all remaining items for deletion, modification or additions.

Mr. Patten does not support the change.

Mr. Llewellyn offered a friendly amendment to have the beginning of the final sentence on page 10, part 3 read “During September of 2017” instead of “During the first half of the third year of implementation.”

Mr. Fattibene said this friendly amendment falls within the date range of his amendment and asked for Dr. Title’s opinion. Dr. Title said he prefers the original wording for maximum flexibility. The friendly amendment was not accepted.

Mr. Llewellyn moved, Mrs. Liu-McCormack seconded to amend the amendment to have the beginning of the final sentence on page 10, part 3 read “In September of 2017” instead of “During the first half of the third year of implementation.”

Mr. Llewellyn said there may not be enough time to change the DIP if we wait too long. Doesn’t know the priorities for the DIP. Mrs. Liu-McCormack said there is a better opportunity for positive change with this amendment in place. We should try to act with urgency to implement possible changes. Both felt the review should happen sooner so that positive changes could be incorporated for the third year.

Mrs. Gerber said specific concerns could be addressed at the annual October review of the implementation status; Dr. Title agreed.

Mr. Llewellyn asked for clarification of ‘status’. Dr. Title said the implementation status review would report (1) the implementation status and any related concerns, and (2) the status of the Student Performance Indicators. The formal review would be a checkpoint that looks at data and implementation issues. A good practice may be to have an ongoing conversation at the Board table to continually update interested parties.

Mr. Dwyer said the document is clear and the Board may review it annually; flexibility will be needed; he does not support the amendment to the amendment.

Mrs. Liu-McCormack clarified her understanding that the annual review would be an update and the third year formal review would include proactive recommendations for Plan changes; Dr. Title said that third year review would be much more extensive. Mrs. Liu-McCormack she is in support of using a specific date in September as it would benefit students more, is more specific, transparent and easy.

Mrs. Gerber read the amendment to the amendment.

Public Comment:

Neal Fink, Crest Terrace: Speaking on his own behalf and not on behalf of PTAC. Supports existing Plan language.

Motion Failed: 4-5

Favor: Mrs. Liu-McCormack, Ms. Karnal, Mr. Fattibene, Mr. Llewellyn

Oppose: Mr. Patten, Mrs. Gerber, Mr. Dwyer, Mr. Convertito, Mrs. Maxon-Kennelly

Mrs. Liu-McCormack said the original amendment is preferable to the existing language.

Public Comment:

Mary Hogue, Fairfield Resident: Concerned with putting specific dates in Plan.

Mr. Fattibene said he prefers a 6 month window; this still allows for flexibility.

Mr. Llewellyn is concerned that things will slip, wants to have this fuller review sooner than later; supports the amendment.

Mr. Dwyer said he believes reviews will occur given the superintendent's dedication to planning.

The original amendment to amend the final sentence on page 10, part 3 to insert "first half of the" after "During the" Failed: 4-5

Favor: Mrs. Liu-McCormack, Ms. Karnal, Mr. Fattibene, Mr. Llewellyn

Oppose: Mr. Patten, Mrs. Gerber, Mr. Dwyer, Mr. Convertito, Mrs. Maxon-Kennelly

Mrs. Maxon-Kennelly asked:

- (1) On page 5, requested an explanation of the role of Dr. Richard Lemons from the CT Center for School Change. Dr. Title said Dr. Lemons was consulted in the past regarding ways to positively implement all the changes from the state; he looked at the initiatives and how close they were to improvement of the instruction. While the Plan was developed by the staff, Dr. Lemons reviewed the Plan for coherence; his biggest question was on the implementation. This discussion led to the development of the new model of School Improvement Plans which will be shared in the fall.
- (2) Examples of continuing initiatives that are already being done. Dr. Title gave several examples including school improvement planning, teacher leadership, and ELL improvement.
- (3) The effectiveness of using PSATs for providing feedback on instruction. Dr. Boice said there are several reports that provide useful data on specific skills; she is expecting these reports to continue with the new version of the PSAT aligned to the Common Core. College Board also has a report for AP Potential, based on student PSAT scores.
- (4) Possible costs and benefits associated with 4-9 on page 31. Mrs. Parks said research on this will take place after Plan approval.

Mrs. Maxon-Kennelly moved, Mrs. Gerber seconded to amend Specific Action 2-8 to read "All teaching staff will have participated in Instructional Rounds within three years."

Mrs. Liu-McCormack asked for clarification as to how often staff participate in Instructional Rounds; Mrs. Maxon-Kennelly gave additional information.

Mrs. Gerber requested Dr. Title's opinion.

Dr. Title is not in favor of amending the Plan. Flexibility is needed; many schools are doing more than this; his concern is that the language is overly prescriptive.

Mrs. Maxon-Kennelly thought this was a worthwhile goal for each staff member.

Mr. Llewellyn asked what 'participating' means; Mrs. Maxon-Kennelly responded that it includes both being observed and observing.

Mr. Patten asked for an example of an instance where Instructional Rounds might not occur. Dr. Title responded speech/language teachers, social workers, and guidance counselors are all examples of positions where Instructional Rounds may not apply.

Mr. Dwyer said this would be too specific and prefers the existing language.

After discussion Mrs. Maxon-Kennelly made a motion to withdraw the amendment, which was approved by unanimous consent.

Mrs. Maxon-Kennelly moved, Ms. Karnal seconded to add as 1-20 (under "Professional Learning" on page 29) a

statement reading “Provide Professional Learning to deepen subject-specific knowledge and understanding.”

Mrs. Maxon-Kennelly said that this implicit language is good practice.

Ms. Karnal said it would be beneficial.

Dr. Title said this is not needed; the language is purposely not specific. He prefers that the Plan not be amended.

Mr. Convertito is not in favor of the motion.

Mrs. Liu-McCormack said more specificity is needed in the DIP; thinks you get better results with more specificity and transparency.

Mr. Llewellyn suggested striking the word ‘deepen,’ but thinks that the amendment is a great idea.

Public Comment:

Tricia Donovan, Fairfield Resident: Supports the amendment.

Mr. Fattibene said the professional learning in this case should be limited to subjects that the teacher is teaching.

Mr. Patten said Professional Development is extremely beneficial, but there may be budget implications if this becomes a requirement.

Mrs. Gerber asked Dr. Title if this would have budget implications. Dr. Title said this is already happening on a regular basis and he thinks this may be a restatement of a current initiative.

Motion Passed: 6-3

Favor: Mrs. Liu-McCormack, Ms. Karnal, Mrs. Gerber, Mr. Fattibene, Mrs. Maxon-Kennelly, Mr. Llewellyn

Opposed: Mr. Patten, Mr. Dwyer, Mr. Convertito

Mr. Dwyer received unanimous consent from the Board to accept Public Comment at this time on the Plan.

Public Comment:

Kelly Jacobsen, Fairfield Resident: Requested the Board review her document with Plan changes.

Ellen Jacob, RTM District 9: Requested a written Board response to her document regarding the Plan.

David Ebling, FSAA President: Requested the Board endorse the District Improvement Plan.

Kelly McWhinnie, Churchill Road: Supports the District Improvement Plan

Lauren O’Brien, Fairfield Resident: Supports the District Improvement Plan; budget concerns.

Neal Fink, Crest Terrace: Supports the comprehensive District Improvement Plan and requested it be approved.

Mr. Patten asked if the District Improvement Plan would have any immediate impact on the current or future budget.

Dr. Title said it will be implemented within the appropriation that has been given.

Mr. Llewellyn asked for the top 5 district priorities.

Mr. Dwyer asked for the process of setting the priorities.

Dr. Title said several criteria for Year 1 would be (1) urgency (2) continuation of existing initiatives (3) cost, and (4) potential for greatest impact on the mission. Priority decisions will be made in conjunction with the Central Office Leadership Team. He will be requesting Board input on priorities, as there may be room for as many as 20. Specific Actions that are continuing practice or considered urgent will be on the priority list which may include 1-1,1-4, 1-6, 1-10, 1-11, 1-12, 1-18, 2-1, 2-7, 2-8, 3-1, 4-20, and 4-14.

Mrs. Liu-McCormack asked why some Specific Actions have a time stamp. Dr. Title said everything will happen within 5 years, those Actions without a specific time noted are assumed to be of one year duration.

Public Comment:

Nancy Haberly, Fairfield Resident: Parent input in Plan.

Mrs. Gerber referenced page 6 and explained that the Mission and Goals as written on that page were approved by the Board of Education in March of 2014 after lengthy discussion and participation by the Mission and Goals Committee, the Policy Committee and the full BoE.

Mr. Dwyer added that the Board participated in many discussions of the Mission and Goals policies.

Mr. Fattibene said the Plan is very comprehensive and while he agrees with most of it, he is concerned with the

prioritization process and budget constraints.

Mr. Dwyer said the Board of Education will remain engaged in the process as will other Town Boards.

Mr. Llewellyn, in reference to page 34, #10, asked if this could be broken down to know which students are taking which courses to understand the levels as opposed to grouping them all as one. Mrs. Parks said there are 4 courses for Calculus, and while the Plan should not be changed, the data could be presented that way.

Mr. Llewellyn moved, Mrs. Liu-McCormack seconded to have Point 10 (page 34) be broken into four courses – Honors Calculus, Calculus AB, Calculus BC, and Multivariable Calculus.

Mr. Llewellyn added that this would provide more insight and the data is readily available.

Mrs. Liu-McCormack agreed and said it would provide transparency.

Mrs. Parks said the concern she heard from the Board was whether students were advancing to the highest levels of Math; all of these courses show advancement in Math which is why it is grouped as a total.

Mr. Llewellyn disagreed, there is a difference between the Calculus courses; he felt he could better gauge the data when viewed by course.

Mr. Dwyer cautioned that adding courses by school could increase the data points, which could make the District Improvement Plan unmanageable; scores belong in the School Improvement Plans.

Mrs. Liu-McCormack felt that trending towards Honors Math is much different than trending towards Multivariable. Statistics are not always provided when requested; this would make the data automatically available to the public.

Ms. Karnal asked how much work would be involved in breaking out the courses. Mrs. Parks said it wouldn't be that much work. She added that combining the classes is a better indicator for monitoring total students accelerated in Math, as requested by the Board. School Plans could focus on specific courses.

Public Comment:

Christine Vitale, Verna Hill Road: Variables in student course selection.

Mrs. Maxon-Kennelly said the combined courses show how well students are being prepared; other small sub-groups are not broken down and the data is readily available.

Mr. Fattibene asked if the prerequisites for the courses are different and Dr. Boice said they do vary. Students may elect to take Honors Calculus due to their course load, even if they are able to take a higher math; this data point measures Calculus and beyond. Student specific course enrollment is handled at the school level. Mrs. Parks added that other AP indicators in the Plan may also show trends. Mr. Fattibene felt the prerequisite distinction was important.

Mr. Llewellyn felt the data could be provided easily from the system so that everyone can see it.

Motion Failed 4-5

Favor: Mrs. Liu-McCormack, Ms. Karnal, Mr. Fattibene, Mr. Llewellyn

Oppose: Mr. Patten, Mrs. Gerber, Mr. Dwyer, Mr. Convertito, Mrs. Maxon-Kennelly

Mr. Llewellyn referenced page 33, and asked for the size of the Free and Reduced sample shown for AP; this was brought to his attention in an email the Board received. Mrs. Parks said she would reply to the email with the requested information. Mr. Llewellyn referenced page 39, #18 and asked for more detail and a break-down of the school climate to be more than just a number. It is a district issue if some schools are not in equilibrium with the majority. Mrs. Parks said the District Climate Committee felt the questions included here are the best measure for students regarding security, classroom support and safety.

Mrs. Maxon-Kennelly asked for more information on the Committee. Mrs. Parks said the District Climate Committee is comprised of parents, administrators, teachers, counselors and social workers; a broad representation of community and school staff. The District Climate Committee selected the questions.

Mr. Llewellyn asked if administration would be open to adding a variance to show outliers in the district; as a district we should be concerned if there are outliers. He also felt that staff sentiment regarding climate should also be incorporated as that affects students.

Mrs. Maxon-Kennelly commented that Mr. Llewellyn's second suggestion would be a significant change to the current Plan. His first suggestion is valid, although it may be already included in the October review.

Mr. Dwyer said the variance reporting occurs during the presentation of the climate survey results. Different surveys

have been used in the past.

Mr. Fattibene was unclear about what exactly is being measured; an improved average of all student responses does not mean all areas are improving.

Mr. Convertito asked if Mr. Llewellyn might accept a report by school. Although the number may not move, the variance could be seen year to year.

Mr. Llewellyn suggested a further breakdown by domain.

Mr. Dwyer said it already is broken down this way in the school climate report.

Mr. Llewellyn moved, Ms. Karnal seconded to suspend the rules and extend the meeting indefinitely.

Mr. Convertito said a timeframe is needed so the Special Meeting planned for redistricting can take place.

Mr. Dwyer polled the audience and noted that 3 people planned to attend that meeting.

Motion Failed 3-6

Favor: Mrs. Liu-McCormack, Ms. Karnal, Mr. Llewellyn

Oppose: Mr. Patten, Mrs. Gerber, Mr. Dwyer, Mr. Convertito, Mr. Fattibene, Mrs. Maxon-Kennelly

Mr. Patten moved, Mr. Convertito seconded to extend the meeting to 11:29PM. Mr. Patten did this so the Special Meeting that was to immediately follow could begin at 11:30.

Mr. Convertito said the Town charter might not permit a meeting to start after 11:30pm. Discussion ensued on what was permissible and which business items were urgent.

Mr. Fattibene asked if the redistricting meeting was an urgent matter.

Mr. Llewellyn preferred to continue discussion on the District Improvement Plan.

Mr. Dwyer said the redistricting meeting could be rescheduled.

Motion Failed 2-7

Favor: Mr. Patten, Mr. Dwyer

Oppose: Mrs. Liu-McCormack, Ms. Karnal, Mrs. Gerber, Mr. Convertito, Mr. Fattibene, Mrs. Maxon-Kennelly, Mr. Llewellyn

Mr. Convertito moved, Mr. Llewellyn seconded to reconsider the motion to suspend the rules and extend the meeting indefinitely.

Motion Passed 7-2

Favor: Mrs. Liu-McCormack, Mr. Patten, Ms. Karnal, Mr. Convertito, Mr. Fattibene, Mrs. Maxon-Kennelly, Mr. Llewellyn

Oppose: Mrs. Gerber, Mr. Dwyer against

Mr. Convertito moved, Mr. Llewellyn seconded to suspend the rules and extend the meeting indefinitely.

Motion Passed 7-2

Favor: Mrs. Liu-McCormack, Mr. Patten, Ms. Karnal, Mr. Convertito, Mr. Fattibene, Mrs. Maxon-Kennelly, Mr. Llewellyn

Oppose: Mrs. Gerber, Mr. Dwyer

Mrs. Maxon-Kennelly opposes breaking it out by school; the committee would have to re-examine metrics if it were to be broken out by domain.

Mr. Llewellyn moved, Mrs. Liu-McCormack seconded to use the metric of percent positive by domain by school.

Mr. Llewellyn said it is important to view this data by school because it will give a better indication. Using percent positive will allow you to see movement, without that schools will counterbalance one another.

Mrs. Liu-McCormack said seeing detail by school shows transparency. Averages across the district aren't telling as to what is going on in the district. Transparency should be made available to the Board and the public. This will just

involve a little extra paperwork. It's a mistake to avoid detail.

Mr. Convertito said the School Improvement Plans drive the numbers; district-level reporting is appropriate for this; he is against the motion.

Mr. Patten agrees with Mr. Convertito.

Mr. Llewellyn requested unanimous consent to amend the motion to add a maximum negative variance by domain, seconded by Mrs. Liu-McCormack.

Mrs. Maxon-Kennelly said it would make sense to have a positive variance, but she is fine with changing it.

Mr. Convertito asked for clarification and was told this motion addressed page 39, point 18.

Mrs. Gerber clarified the motion was to amend the motion to add maximum negative variance by domain by school.

Mr. Patten said he was not giving consent.

Mr. Dwyer said that without unanimous consent the motion on the table is to use the metric of percent positive by domain by school.

Mr. Llewellyn requested and received unanimous consent to withdraw the motion.

Mr. Llewellyn moved, Ms. Karnal seconded to change the measurement under 18, school climate survey, page 39 to "percent positive responses by domain", and to add a second measurement "to establish a maximum negative variance by domain as measured by school."

Mr. Llewellyn clarified that negative variance means no one school can be greater than 5%, or the Board can discuss that.

Public Comment:

Dorene Herron, Forest Avenue: Disapproves of changes.

Mr. Fattibene can understand percent positive by domain, but is unclear on the negative variance by school.

Mrs. Maxon-Kennelly moved, Mr. Llewellyn seconded to divide the motion.

Public comment: None

Motion Passed 7-2

Favor: Mrs. Liu-McCormack, Mr. Patten, Ms. Karnal, Mr. Convertito, Mr. Fattibene, Mrs. Maxon-Kennelly, Mr. Llewellyn

Oppose: Mrs. Gerber, Mr. Dwyer

Mr. Convertito made a friendly amendment to make the document consistent so that page 20, 18.1, be changed to the same language as has been stated in the motion.

Mr. Dwyer requested and received unanimous consent from the Board.

Public Comment: None

Mrs. Gerber re-read the first part of the divided motion: To change the measurement under 18, page 39, to percent positive responses by domain and conform to the description on page 20, 18.1.

Mr. Fattibene asked for clarification on percent positive response. His perception is that it's a statement of agreement in the response.

Mr. Llewellyn said numbers are assigned to give a percent, which could be positive or negative responses.

Mr. Dwyer said the school climate team came up with this approach. He would keep it the way it is and let the climate team show us the variance in the next reports.

Mrs. Maxon-Kennelly only wants this broken out by domain, she does see the value of this as three separate entities. She does see Mr. Fattibene's point.

Mr. Llewellyn clarified that it is favorable vs. unfavorable response. It's not hard to understand the differences.

Mrs. Parks said she understand the concerns, but thinks that a committee member should clarify this.

Mr. Llewellyn said he was able to go through the data very quickly

Mrs. Liu-McCormack said the Board should define favorable and unfavorable.

Mr. Patten suggested a friendly amendment to break this out by domain and not specify percentages or how it's done.

Mr. Convertito said that Ms. Leonardi has already done this.

Mr. Fattibene suggested it be broken down by domain, and while all this data is available, improvement must be measured in a meaningful way.

Mr. Llewellyn said his issue is with the extremes; a simple average won't account for the variation.

Mr. Convertito felt this would drive the information in a different manner than was intended.

Mrs. Maxon-Kennelly asked if Mr. Llewellyn would be willing to drop the percent favorable to break it out by domain.

Mr. Llewellyn made a friendly amendment to change the motion to "average of all student responses by domain." The Board did not give unanimous consent.

Mrs. Gerber re-read the 1st part of the divided motion: To change the measurement under 18, page 39, to percent positive responses by domain and to conform to the description on page 20, 18.1.

Motion Failed: 3-6

Favor: Mrs. Liu-McCormack, Ms. Karnal, Mr. Llewellyn

Oppose: Mr. Patten, Mrs. Gerber, Mr. Dwyer, Mr. Convertito, Mr. Fattibene, Mrs. Maxon-Kennelly

Mrs. Gerber read the second part of the divided motion: "to establish a maximum negative variance by domain as measured by school."

Public Comment: None

Mr. Llewellyn requested this motion be withdrawn as it makes no sense without the first part; Mrs. Liu-McCormack agreed and the Board gave unanimous consent.

Mr. Dwyer asked for comments on the main motion to approve the District Improvement Plan.

Mr. Convertito noted that months of work went into the Plan and recommended moving forward with its approval.

Mr. Llewellyn said he had changed his language several times to try and accommodate the Board.

Mrs. Liu-McCormack moved, Ms. Karnal seconded to insert "K-5" just prior to "World Language" in Specific Action 1-1 (page 28).

Mrs. Liu-McCormack said we already have an elementary level plan in World Language; this will clarify the Plan to have World Language down to the Kindergarten Level.

Mr. Dwyer felt the Board has been very clear on this in approving a K-12 plan.

Mr. Patten prefers the current language, as this new language may have a budget impact.

Mr. Convertito agreed with Mr. Patten; the existing language provides flexibility.

Public Comment: None

Mrs. Liu-McCormack said that this implies that there is support for World Language going all the way down to kindergarten. She thinks that not approving this because of budget concerns is singling this out and is superfluous.

Motion Passed: 6-3

Favor: Mrs. Liu-McCormack, Ms. Karnal, Mrs. Gerber, Mr. Dwyer, Mr. Fattibene, Mr. Llewellyn

Oppose: Mr. Patten, Mrs. Maxon-Kennelly, Mr. Convertito

Mr. Llewellyn moved, Mrs. Liu-McCormack seconded to change item 18, page 39 to read “average of all student responses by domain”.

Mr. Fattibene said responses by domain is preferred and the administration could insert a meaningful baseline data point.

Mr. Llewellyn agreed.

Mr. Dwyer said he would not support changing this language at the Board table and suggested addressing this change at a later date.

Mr. Fattibene made a friendly amendment to change the wording to “average responses by domain” which was accepted by unanimous consent.

Mrs. Gerber asked for clarification – is this all responses by domain? The answer was yes.

Mr. Llewellyn said he has asked for the information this way since March.

Mr. Dwyer said that the information Mr. Llewellyn used is available to the public

Mrs. Liu-McCormack asked for clarification regarding how many responses, the answer was “average responses by domain”

Public Comment:

Greg Hatzis, FLHS Headmaster: Domains have different meanings in a previous climate survey.

Mr. Convertito cautioned the Board on changing language that was carefully crafted for a specific purpose.

Amended Motion Passed 5-4

Favor: Mrs. Liu-McCormack, Ms. Karnal, Mr. Fattibene, Mrs. Maxon-Kennelly, Mr. Llewellyn

Oppose: Mr. Patten, Mrs. Gerber, Mr. Dwyer, Mr. Convertito

Ms. Karnal expressed concern about the budget impact of the Plan, and whether trade-offs may occur.

Mr. Dwyer said the Board always has budget decisions to make and he is comfortable passing the Plan.

Mrs. Liu-McCormack said she doesn’t mind approving the content of the Plan but would like to see assigned budget numbers next to items in the Plan before implementation.

Mr. Dwyer clarified that Dr. Title’s initiatives are also reviewed by the Board.

Mrs. Liu-McCormack moved, Mr. Llewellyn seconded to amend the main motion and add to the end of the motion “with the proviso that the timeline, the budgetary implications and the prioritization of implementation of each item should be brought to the Board for approval prior to implementation.”

Mrs. Liu-McCormack said this is a better process so the Board can participate in the discussion of the implementation.

Mr. Llewellyn agreed.

Ms. Karnal asked for clarification on ‘each item’. Mrs. Liu-McCormack restated that each item refers to the Specific Actions.

Mr. Llewellyn said this will give the Board the opportunity to adjust.

Mrs. Maxon-Kennelly disagrees with this motion; the district needs to begin implementation and the Plan should not be micromanaged; there needs to be trust in the professionals. Some budget estimates would be useless, particularly those 5 years out.

Mrs. Liu-McCormack said the public may want to provide comment. This is an attempt to include the community.

Mrs. Maxon-Kennelly has heard from the public, and much of it was to proceed with the Plan. The district needs to be on the road to improvement.

Mr. Fattibene said the problem is that the Plan is over-encompassing and it should go in the direction the Board wishes.

Mr. Llewellyn said prioritization is important; he particularly felt resources should be the highest priority.

Mr. Dwyer said the Board could give guidance on which items are important.

Public Comment: None

Motion Failed 3-6

Favor: Mrs. Liu-McCormack, Ms. Karnal, Mr. Llewellyn

Oppose: Mr. Patten, Mrs. Gerber, Mr. Dwyer, Mr. Convertito, Mr. Fattibene, Mrs. Maxon-Kennelly

The original motion, as moved by Mrs. Maxon-Kennelly and seconded by Mr. Patten now reads “that the Board of Education approve the District Improvement Plan dated July 9, 2015, as amended.”

Motion Passed 9-0

Superintendent’s Report – Budget Transfers for the 2014-2015 Fiscal Year

Mr. Dwyer said the Board has already approved the budget transfers but Mr. Llewellyn had a few remaining questions.

Mr. Llewellyn asked for a breakdown of legal services and Mrs. Munsell provided actual numbers: 270 for Special Education, 225 for Labor and Negotiations, 95 for Arbitration, and 150 for General Matters.

Mr. Dwyer said this won’t add up to 909 as the numbers are actual up to that point in time.

Mr. Llewellyn said that \$320,000 is still unaccounted for.

Mrs. Munsell said that the numbers are as of June 18, but in some cases May invoices may not be included due to late invoicing by attorneys; 909 is a good estimate and should not go higher.

Mr. Llewellyn asked if it might be possible to get the transfer sheet broken out with beginning and ending balances and whether it maps back to the major classification summary object. He asked for a list of object codes and major classification that go with each.

Ms. Munsell said in some cases it will map back, but won’t in cases where items are not encumbered; she will provide the list as requested.

Mr. Llewellyn requested clarification on whether school activity funds are reimbursed for payment of outstanding student account balances.

Mrs. Munsell said each school handles this differently depending on the situation. Student balances are zeroed out at year-end.

Mr. Dwyer confirmed that each school pays outstanding balances to food services from the student activity account; some students pay it back and others don’t. He asked Ms. Munsell to provide more clarity.

Ms. Karnal asked about positive balances that remain post-graduation. Mrs. Munsell said that money is refunded to the parent, or it can be transferred to a sibling. If parents don’t claim the money, it remains in Food Services. Ms. Karnal asked for a breakdown of all legal fees and bills for the last year. Ms. Munsell suggested waiting until the year closes in the fall to get an actual total.

Mr. Dwyer reiterated that Mrs. Munsell does not anticipate the number going higher than the projection, and he repeated the breakdown as previously provided.

Mr. Patten asked about the transportation number. Mrs. Munsell said she will get back to him on the savings in transportation.

Mr. Llewellyn asked if the Board will be required to vote on a subsequent transfer.

Mr. Dwyer asked Mrs. Munsell to look into whether Board action is required due to the district’s unanticipated reduction in Special Education bills, which allowed for a higher deposit into the medical insurance fund.

Approval of the Minutes of April 7, 2015 Regular Meeting

Mrs. Maxon-Kennelly moved, Mrs. Gerber seconded that the Board of Education approve the Minutes of the Regular Meeting of April 7, 2015.

Mr. Llewellyn moved, Mrs. Liu-McCormack seconded to insert the amendment listed as “Enclosure No. 7, June 9 2015” into the April 7 Minutes.

Mr. Llewellyn asked if Public Comment would be allowed.

Mr. Dwyer said he was only aware that Public Comment was requested on the May 19 minutes.

Mr. Llewellyn said the red-line language he is inserting reflects the conversation that was captured at the table.

M. Dwyer said per Roberts Rules, minutes should reflect what was done at a meeting and not what was said; adding substantial comments would make minutes lengthy.

Mrs. Maxon-Kennelly is opposed to anything that is now becoming a transcript and believes the essence of Mr. Llewellyn's comment was captured.

Mr. Llewellyn disagreed and said some statements were omitted which changed the essence and meaning.

Motion Failed: 3-6

Favor: Mrs. Liu-McCormack, Mr. Fattibene, Mr. Llewellyn

Oppose: Mr. Patten, Ms. Karnal, Mrs. Gerber, Mr. Dwyer, Mr. Convertito, Mrs. Maxon-Kennelly against.

Original motion to approve the Minutes Passed: 6-3

Favor: Mr. Patten, Ms. Karnal, Mrs. Gerber, Mr. Dwyer, Mr. Convertito, Mrs. Maxon-Kennelly

Oppose: Mrs. Liu-McCormack, Mr. Fattibene, Mr. Llewellyn

Approval of the Minutes of April 21, 2015 Special Meeting

Mrs. Maxon-Kennelly moved, Mrs. Gerber seconded that the Board of Education approve the Minutes of the Special Meeting of April 21, 2015.

Mr. Llewellyn moved, Mrs. Liu-McCormack seconded to insert the amendment listed as "Enclosure No. 8, June 9 2015" into the April 21 Minutes.

Mr. Llewellyn said his requests for information about Walter Fitzgerald were not included. Also eliminated was his question and Dr. Title's response on the school's performance.

Mrs. Liu-McCormack said this is a continuing trend. She supports the amendment.

Motion Failed: 4-5

Favor: Mrs. Liu-McCormack, Ms. Karnal, Mr. Fattibene, Mr. Llewellyn

Oppose: Mr. Patten, Mrs. Gerber, Mr. Dwyer, Mr. Convertito, Mrs. Maxon-Kennelly

Original motion to approve the Minutes Passed: 7-2

Favor: Mr. Patten, Mrs. Gerber, Mr. Dwyer, Mr. Convertito, Mrs. Maxon-Kennelly, Ms. Karnal, Mr. Fattibene

Oppose: Mrs. Liu-McCormack, Mr. Llewellyn

Approval of Minutes of May 19, 2015 Regular Meeting

Mr. Dwyer explained that these minutes have previously failed to be approved due to a tie vote. He asked one of the 4 members who voted in the negative to move to reconsider.

Ms. Karnal moved, Mr. Convertito seconded to reconsider the approval of the Minutes of the May 19, 2015 Regular Meeting.

Motion Passed: 6-3

Favor: Mr. Patten, Ms. Karnal, Mrs. Gerber, Mr. Dwyer, Mr. Convertito, Mrs. Maxon-Kennelly

Oppose: Mrs. Liu-McCormack, Mr. Fattibene, Mr. Llewellyn

Mrs. Maxon-Kennelly moved, Mrs. Gerber seconded that the Board of Education approve the Minutes of the **Regular Meeting** of May 19, 2015.

Mr. Dwyer read a provision from Roberts Rules on page 19 regarding established custom, or what he refers to as past practice; established custom can be treated practically as if prescribed as a rule. Should a member of the public request

Public Comment on the minutes, he will ask a Board member to ask for a Point of Order.

Mr. Llewellyn asked for a Point of Order.

Public Comment:

Jan Reber, Fairfield Resident: Minutes should reflect more complete public comment.

Christine Vitale, Verna Hill Road: Detailed public comment is a slippery slope.

Nancy Haberly, Fairfield Resident: Residents need to be heard.

Dorene Herron, Forest Ave: Asked the Board to approve the minutes and move on.

Mr. Dwyer reminded the Board of Roberts Rules, page 471, which states the name and subject of a speaker can be given, but no effort should be made to summarize remarks.

Mrs. Liu-McCormack asked if the Board could authorize incorporating public comment in the minutes.

Mr. Dwyer said the Board could change the by-laws during the November discussion.

Mrs. Liu-McCormack asked if she could raise the issue at any time, and Mr. Dwyer said it could not be done at a Special Meeting.

Ms. Karnal suggested the Board spends a tremendous amount of time on minutes, and perhaps the Board could vote to do them differently.

Mr. Dwyer said the subject of minutes has been an annual conversation and the Board can't seem to unanimously agree.

Mr. Fattibene said different standards exist for published minutes and there has been and is a difference of opinion. It's not a simple question.

Mr. Dwyer said a By-law can be changed and Board members can advance ideas on how minutes will be taken, but that conversation should be noticed for a separate meeting.

Motion Failed 4-4-1

Favor: Mr. Patten, Mrs. Gerber, Mr. Dwyer, Mrs. Maxon-Kennelly

Oppose: Mrs. Liu-McCormack, Ms. Karnal, Mr. Fattibene, Mr. Llewellyn

Abstain: Mr. Convertito

Mr. Dwyer said this set of minutes will appear on every agenda until the minutes are approved as required by the Town.

Mr. Fattibene disagreed, saying minutes have to be filed with the Town Clerk, not necessarily approved minutes. Mr.

Dwyer said he would check with the Town Clerk and will report back to the Board.

Approval of Minutes of June 9, 2015 Special Meeting

Mr. Convertito moved, Mr. Patten seconded that the Board of Education approve the Minutes of the **Special Meeting** of June 9, 2015.

Motion Passed: 9-0

Approval of Minutes of June 9, 2015 Regular Meeting

Mrs. Gerber moved, Mrs. Maxon-Kennelly seconded that the Board of Education approve the Minutes of the **Regular Meeting** of June 9, 2015.

Motion Passed: 6-3

Favor: Mr. Patten, Ms. Karnal, Mrs. Gerber, Mr. Dwyer, Mr. Convertito, Mrs. Maxon-Kennelly

Oppose: Mrs. Liu-McCormack, Mr. Fattibene, Mr. Llewellyn

Approval of Minutes of June 23, 2015 Special Meeting

Mrs. Gerber moved, Mrs. Maxon-Kennelly seconded that the Board of Education approve the Minutes of the **Special Meeting** of June 23, 2015.

Motion Passed: 8-0-1

Favor: Mrs. Liu-McCormack, Ms. Karnal, Mrs. Gerber, Mr. Dwyer, Mr. Convertito, Mr. Fattibene, Mrs. Maxon-Kennelly
Mr. Llewellyn
Abstain: Mr. Patten

Approval of Minutes of June 23, 2015 Regular Meeting

Mrs. Maxon-Kennelly moved, Mrs. Gerber seconded that the Board of Education approve the Minutes of the **Regular Meeting** of June 23, 2015.

Mr. Llewellyn said that once again these reflect selectiveness over comments made; the public comment topics are inaccurate, sections are missing regarding the discussion of the handbook; there are filtered comments, and he will not support the minutes that are half the story, they can't just be one-sided. He won't make a motion because he knows how they go.

Mrs. Maxon-Kennelly wants an accurate essence captured but does not want a transcript. A process is in place when there are inaccuracies; especially when submitted ahead of time out of courtesy to the secretary. This has become time consuming.

Mr. Llewellyn said he made two amendments before, he will make comments, they were not transcripts.

Motion Passed: 5-4

Favor: Mr. Patten, Mrs. Gerber, Mr. Dwyer, Mr. Convertito, Mrs. Maxon-Kennelly
Oppose: Mrs. Liu-McCormack, Ms. Karnal, Mr. Fattibene, Mr. Llewellyn

<i>Adjournment</i>

Ms. Karnal moved, Mr. Patten seconded that this Special Meeting of the Board of Education adjourn.

Motion Passed: 9-0

Meeting adjourned at 1:23AM.

Respectfully Submitted
Jessica Gerber
Fairfield Board of Education
Secretary

* Board discussion ensued regarding the Special Meeting that was to begin immediately following the Regular Meeting. Due to the late hour, the Special Meeting will be rescheduled .