

SOUTHINGTON BOARD OF EDUCATION

SOUTHINGTON, CONNECTICUT

REGULAR MEETING

JUNE 26, 2014
(Revised 7-10-14)

The regular meeting of the Southington Board of Education was held on Thursday, June 26, 2014 at 6:30 p.m. in the Municipal Center Public Assembly Room, 200 North Main Street, Southington, Connecticut.

1. CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Goralski, Chairperson, called the meeting to order at 6:33 p.m.

Board members present: Mr. Brian Goralski, Chairperson; Mrs. Jill Notar-Francesco, Secretary; Mrs. Colleen Clark, Mr. David Derynoski, Mrs. Patricia Johnson, Mrs. Terry Lombardi, Mr. Zaya Oshana and Mrs. Patricia Queen (arrived at 6:35 p.m.). Absent: Mrs. Terri Carmody, Vice Chairperson.

Present from the administration: Mrs. Karen Smith, Interim Superintendent of Schools, and Mrs. Kim Hunt, Personnel Manager. Also present was Mr. Timothy Connellan.

MOTION: by Mr. Derynoski, seconded by Mr. Oshana:

“Move to go into Executive Session, excluding the public and the press, for the purpose of discussing Personnel Matters, and upon conclusion reconvene to public session.”

Motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

2. EXECUTIVE SESSION TO DISCUSS PERSONNEL MATTERS ~ 6:30 p.m.

The Board went into Executive Session at 6:33 p.m.

Mr. Goralski declared the Executive Session had ended at 7:08 p.m.

3. CELEBRATION OF EXCELLENCE ~ 7:00 P.M.

At 7:12 p.m., in Celebration of Excellence, the Board recognized the following honorees:

SOUTHINGTON HIGH SCHOOL ALL-STATE ATHLETES FOR 2013-2014

Football – All-State Overall Team	Stephen Barmore, Kyle Smick, Alexander Jamele
Football – All-State Overall Team and Hartford Courant Male Athlete of 2014	Zachary Maxwell
Football – All-State	Zachary Jamele

Gymnastics – All-State 1st Team	Kayla Nati, Alexandra Rothstein, Marilyn Sporbert, Victoria Castillo
Gymnastics – All-State 2 nd Team	Taryn Meenan
Ice Hockey – All-State	Kevin Cop
Wrestling – All-State	Zachary Maxwell
Softball – All-State 1 st Team	Rachel Dube, Sydney Ferrante, Kendra Friedt
Girls Lacrosse – All-State 2 nd Team	Carolynn Keal
Boys Volleyball – All-State	Dan Connolly, Adam Brush
Baseball – All-State	Joseph Rivera, Zachary Susi
Golf – All-State	Andrew Szandrocha

The students were presented with a Certificate of Excellence from Mr. Goralski, Board Chairman, assisted by Mr. Eric Swallow, Athletic Director.

4. RECONVENE MEETING ~ REGULAR SESSION ~ 7:30 P.M.

The regular session was reconvened at 7:34 p.m. by Chairperson, Mr. Brian Goralski. Board members present were Mrs. Colleen Clark, Mr. David Derynoski, Mrs. Patricia Johnson, Mrs. Terry Lombardi, Mrs. Jill Notar-Francesco, Mr. Zaya Oshana and Mrs. Patricia Queen. Absent was Mrs. Terri Carmody.

Present from the administration were Mrs. Karen Smith, Interim Superintendent, and Mrs. Sherri DiNello, Director of Business and Finance

There were approximately 15 people in the audience.

5. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The audience recited the Pledge of Allegiance.

6. APPROVAL OF MINUTES ~ June 12, 2014

MOTION: by Mrs. Notar-Francesco, seconded by Mr. Derynoski:

“Move to approve the regular Board of Education meeting minutes of June 12, 2014, as revised.”

Motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

a. Approval of Special Meeting Minutes ~ June 24, 2014

MOTION: by Mrs. Notar-Francesco, seconded by Mr. Derynoski:

“Move to approve the special Board of Education meeting minutes of June 24, 2014.”

Motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

MOTION: by Mrs. Notar-Francesco, seconded by Mr. Oshana:

“Move to move Agenda Item 10.e ‘Appointment of Director of Operations’ to Agenda Item 6.b.”

Motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

b. Appointment of Director of Operations (*formerly Agenda Item 10.e*)

MOTION: by Mrs. Lombardi, seconded by Mrs. Clark:

“Move to appoint Peter Romano to the position of Director of Operations with a salary of \$100,000 and a start day of July 1, 2014.

ROLL CALL VOTE – YES: Mr. Oshana, Mrs. Queen, Mrs. Clark, Mr. Derynoski, Mrs. Johnson, Mrs. Lombardi, Mrs. Notar-Francesco, Mr. Goralski.

Motion carried unanimously 8-0.

Mr. Romano thanked all who participated in the interview process and the Board of Education for having the confidence in him and providing him with the opportunity to be part of a stellar team. He looks forward to continuing the quality of services that the Operation’s Department has been providing, and will continue on a best principles practice approach and strive for improvement.

*Mr. Goralski called for a brief recess to welcome Mr. Romano at 7:37 p.m.
The meeting reconvened at 7:45 p.m.*

7. COMMUNICATIONS

a. Communications from Audience

There was no audience communication.

b. Communications from Board Members and Administration

Communication from the Board Members:

Mrs. Queen reported that she attended the last meeting of the year for the Library Advisory Committee this week. The work being done by this committee to transform the Southington High School Library/Media Center to a 21st Century hub of learning was actively underway. The committee is committed to transforming the traditional Library/Media Center into a Learning Commons which is a 21st Century Library and Digital Literacy Center. Since her last report, they visited five public school libraries (Cheshire, Clinton, Waterford, Madison, and New Canaan) that are in the process of changing their traditional Library/Media Center model. She noted that the Librarian in New Canaan is the presenter of the TEDx talks that she had sent to the Board members. This will give them a view of a 21st Century education for students. Mrs. Queen pointed out that Stephanie Patterson, Southington High School Librarian, planned to

(Revised 7-10-14)

continue to research the Learning Commons this summer. Through Cooperative Educational Services (CES), Ms. Patterson has fund an opportunity to apply for a spot in Cohort 1 of the 2014-2016 “Re-imagining Your Library Media Center” planning and implementation series but that discussion with administration around the viability of this is at the very beginning stages. This summer, there will be some technology upgrades at the high school. She noted that Dr. Semmel has directed a link to be added to the main page of the high school website. Mrs. Queen recommended that the Board receive a presentation in the fall and that this project be a topic for the Curriculum and Instruction Committee. *(Revised 7-10-14)*

Mr. Oshana questioned the progress of the study on teacher time out of the classroom. Mrs. Smith reported that they are working on the report and that the data collected last year would be impossible to replicate perfectly because school ended. She asked Mrs. Hunt, Personnel Manager, to collect data on three different periods of time (fall, winter, spring) in the course of the last school year with two-week blocks. They will pull out personal days, sick days, school business days and professional development days and that format will be followed the next school year when they will be comparing “apples to apples.”

Mr. Derynoski reported that graduation day was a highlight of the Board’s work and he thanked Mr. Terino and his crew for doing an amazing job in organizing it under the threat of inclement weather.

Communication from Administration:

Mrs. Smith reported on the following:

1. Southington High School Graduation 2014: Mrs. Smith agreed with everything that Mr. Derynoski said about graduation and congratulated the Queen family for Alex Queen’s recognition as Valedictorian. Mrs. Smith added that it was a special class for her because she knew 121 of the graduates since they entered Kindergarten.
2. End of School - 2014: Mrs. Smith spoke to all the administrators who agreed that it was a smooth ending to the school year. She noted that the administrators at the middle schools did a spectacular job in continuing to focus on curriculum and instruction for the students despite the construction projects.
3. Professional Development: Mrs. Smith reported that August 26 and 27 are Professional Development Days with Google Docs training for every teacher Pre-Kindergarten through Grade 12.

Mr. Goralski questioned when Convocation would be held. Mrs. Smith replied August 25 with a Health Fair at 7:30 a.m. in the Southington High School cafeteria and Convocation beginning at 9:00 a.m. in the auditorium.

8. REPORT OF THE SUPERINTENDENT

a. Curriculum & Instruction Committee Meeting ~ June 16, 2014

Mrs. Notar-Francesco reported that Mr. Terino shared an overview of the current Grade 9 Team Leader Pilot Program at the June 16, 2014 Curriculum & Instruction meeting. His report concluded that the Team Pilot was a success for the 80 Grade 9 students who participated. She noted that the high school would like to repeat the program again during the next school year,

and requested that the Board support a second Grade 9 Team Pilot Program that would require an additional stipend of \$1,417. She reported that Mr. Terino provided academic comparisons of the team data versus the off-team group and noted that suspensions were lower in the team group than in the non-team group. Although Language Arts showed no difference between the groups, Math (Algebra) success was significant in the pilot team. The Curriculum and Instruction Committee endorsed the request to continue it as a pilot program for 2014-2015 and agreed to implement the second team.

MOTION: by Mrs. Notar-Francesco, seconded by Mrs. Queen:

“Move to approve the second stipend position for the Grade 9 Team Pilot Program of \$1,417 to allow for the continuation of the pilot.”

Mrs. Johnson was surprised at the amount of the stipend. She noted that Mr. Terino had said that if they did all of the students in Grade 9 there would be five and one-half teams. She recommended that it was something that they could look at in the future because it was an extremely rich program. Mrs. Lombardi pointed out that the Board has already acted in support of this because at budget time they approved an additional paraprofessional that would allow for these teachers to start forming a second team. She was in support of more teams.

Mr. Derynoski asked what the stipend would cover. Mrs. Notar-Francesco replied that there was a lengthy description that Mr. Terino had distributed of what exactly the stipend would cover. Mr. Goralski requested that it be included in the minutes (*Attachment #1*). Mr. Derynoski wanted to know what they would get for the \$1,417. Mrs. Smith replied that she would send the Board a copy of the job description and that, unlike a department chair or assistant department chair, it is a full teaching load. Mr. Derynoski was in favor of this, but wanted to know what they are getting for the \$1,417 stipend. Mr. Goralski added that is why the job description attached to the minutes might help the public understand as well. Mrs. Notar-Francesco reiterated that with the pilot team they were getting increased student achievement and improved behavior. Mrs. Lombardi added that she thought the cost was a bargain.

Motion carried unanimously by voice vote 8 – 0.

Mrs. Queen reported that she, Dr. Semmel [Principal at Southington High School] and Julie Robertson [Guidance Director] have been working on the Southington High School Profile that accompanies a transcript such as when a student applies for college. The edited version will be presented to the Curriculum and Instruction Committee at their next meeting. Mr. Goralski requested that it be on the Board agenda in the next Curriculum and Instruction Committee report for the full Board to view.

9. OLD BUSINESS

a. Town Government Communications

There was no communication.

b. Construction Update

Mr. Goralski reported that, on the last day of school after the students were released, demolition was already taking place at the middle schools by 1:00 p.m. He stated that it will be a totally different building when the students return for the 2014-2015 school year.

c. Administrator Evaluation Plan Update

Mrs. Smith reported that this week and next week she was meeting with the administrative team for their evaluations and that it takes about two hours per administrator to do a thorough job. She pointed this out because, to implement the Teacher Evaluation Plan well, all stages of the evaluation require time. She thanked the Board for the Teacher Leaders because it will provide some level of relief, as well as more professional growth for teachers in the next school year. The principals have told her that two hours was typical when they had evaluation meetings with teachers. Mrs. Smith stated that the two hours were worth it because they have rich conversations.

d. Teacher Evaluation Plan Update

Mrs. Smith reported that, once again, they have options to change the Teacher Evaluation Plan. It is not mandated, but is an option because guidelines have been changed. She stated that portions of the committee sub-groups are meeting through July 16, 2014 to revise the last Teacher Evaluation Plan that the Board adopted. The revisions will be minor and it will be more sensible. She noted that the Board would be receiving a revised Teacher Evaluation Plan in August or September.

10. NEW BUSINESS

a. Greenskies Presentation (*Moved from Agenda Item 10.b*)

Mrs. Lombardi excused herself from all Greenskies discussions and the presentation because her son's employer does business with this vendor.

Mrs. Smith explained that Greenskies presented their plan to the Town Council on May 27, 2014 to install solar panels on several municipal properties as well as South End, Plantsville and Hatton Elementary Schools. She invited Mr. Andrew Chester, Senior Vice President of Greenskies in Middletown, Connecticut, to the podium to give a presentation and to share with the Board what the Town Council already adopted as a program, which would be a cost savings and energy efficient.

Mr. Chester explained that Greenskies was a solar energy development company that was founded in 2008. One of the programs they offer is a Power Purchase Agreement, which is a concept by which Greenskies will finance, own, develop, build and maintain solar energy assets and then sell the energy that is produced to an end user such as the Town of Southington at a reduced rate than what the town is currently paying. It is a way for towns to realize a savings on their electricity expenses.

Mr. Chester explained that his company worked with Mr. Cox to identify viable school sites for installation. They worked with the town and Mr. Brumback through a competitive process. The sites are Plantsville School, which will be a roof-mounted solar array, and Hatton and South End Elementary schools, which will be ground-mounted solar arrays on adjacent

property. The three systems will all be interconnected into the services at these locations and will use the energy produced when it is created. During the summer, when the schools may not be using the power, it is grid connected so, when the energy demand is not there, it is shared with the grid and the town is given a credit for the power that was created.

Mr. Chester gave projections of what Greenskies expects each solar array to produce on an annual basis. He noted that they are planning to install the roof-mounted array at Plantsville School this calendar year and that it is under engineering. When it is completed, they would then discuss construction protocol with the appropriate parties. It will produce 197,000 kilowatt hours in a given year. They will not be making any penetrations of the rooftop and will not affect the warranty of the facilities rooftop. They will install scaffolding or have a scissor-lift onsite to gain access to the roof and will not be in the school. They will have a fenced-in and secured staging area and bring in their own portable toilets. The only time they will need to be in the building is to make an interconnection where the power from the solar array is tied into the school, which is a quick and simple task.

Mr. Chester explained the savings and that they agreed to an eight-cent rate compared to 14.8 cents that the school district is now paying. It is a significant savings that will start off with \$13,000-\$14,000 in year one and escalate over the life of the contract. The total savings at Plantsville School over a 20-year term would be approximately \$400,000.

Mr. Goralski stated that Mr. Peter Romano, Director of Operations, would be the point person through the Superintendent's office to coordinate all of the construction activities to ensure the safety and security of the students. He asked the protocol for hiring and screening for Greenskies employees and if students should be in school during their work. Mr. Chester responded that their sister company, Centerplan Construction, builds all of Greenskies projects and they have onsite Project Managers and Superintendents. They also have a structured agreement with the IBEW Union for electrical workers and hire directly from the union with highly-skilled electricians on-site overseen by Centerplan and Greenskies management. Mr. Goralski stated that the school system has procedures in place with their building projects, and he wanted to make sure that similar procedures were in place during Greenskies project.

Mrs. Clark asked how long the construction project would take to install the roof-top array. Mr. Chester replied that a project of that size would take approximately 3-4 weeks. Their current goal is to do it before the students return the end of August; however, he will not know that until engineering is complete and the permitting process is underway.

Mrs. Johnson questioned the maintenance of the solar array. Mr. Chester replied that the cost and responsibility is Greenskies to maintain. They have a maintenance team on staff that monitors all of the arrays. There are two planned and scheduled annual visits to do diagnostic checks on the arrays and they are monitored live 24/7. There is equipment installed that sends data to the web at five-minute intervals. In the event of an emergency, they would send someone out immediately. There are no moving parts and they do not need to be cleaned or have snow shoveled off them so there is minimal maintenance required. Mrs. Johnson asked about the onsite emergency employees. Mr. Chester replied that they have crews of two, which are licensed union electricians. They carry with them safety equipment for medium voltage and test the solar panels, usually spending four to six hours.

Mr. Chester explained that the ground-mounted arrays would be fenced in and secured. If there is grass growing in that area, it is Greenskies duty to maintain the grounds around the arrays. The ground-mounted is a longer engineering process because of civil engineering. These projects have been pushed to 2015 because they don't want to run into winter conditions and would like to break ground with these in the springtime. The conduit would be run underground to the electrical room. For the Hatton Elementary School project the savings would be approximately \$26,000-\$27,000 annually for year one and would produce 426,000 kilowatt hours in year one. The South End Elementary School project is smaller and they anticipate to produce 340,000 kilowatt hours showing a savings of \$22,000-\$23,000 in year one. The total year one savings for all three schools would be approximately \$60,000.

Mr. Chester stated that in many instances they have installed flat-screen televisions in lobbies of clients and can give the school system direct access to their monitoring web links to be used in classrooms. They use the online monitoring on a 24/7 basis. They could customize the data for the school system such as for the science and math classes.

Mr. Timothy Connellan, Southington Superintendent of Schools starting in August, came to the dais. When he was in Bethany, they had a roof-mounted array and he questioned the size and weight of the array at Plantsville, and if there is structural engineering that would provide a guarantee that the snow load would not adversely affect the building. Mr. Chester replied that they work with every roof manufacturer in the country and there is protocol in place that Greenskies follows and they will do both pre and post inspections with a manufacturer's representative that will keep the warranties intact. From a structural perspective, they will have a licensed third-party structural engineer assess the building and the solar array. These are ballasted and non-penetrating and are roughly at a ten-degree pitch, so there is not much wind uplift. It will be designed with the local snow and wind codes. He noted that they have gone through hurricanes and had zero issues.

Mr. Derynoski thought this was a great idea and asked why it was only three school locations. Mr. Chester replied that these particular sites were originally identified with Mr. Cox and Dr. Erardi over one year ago and updated six months ago. The other project that they are doing with the town is at the landfill with a ground-mounted array.

Mr. Oshana thought that tying into the curriculum and educating the students was a key component. He thought that the Board would take Mr. Chester up on the offer of the televisions and monitoring system to work something into the curriculum so the students would understand what is happening on the roof and also the impact that it is having on the environment as a whole. Mr. Oshana asked how Greenskies came up with the rate escalation versus the utility escalation. Mr. Chester replied that Greenskies escalation was submitted in a competitive process through the town a few months ago. They typically use an inflation rate of three percent, which is conservative escalation. It has been showing a trend of an average of six or seven percent over the last 20 years. Greenskies escalation rate will be going up by one percent each year and the utility inflation rate will be three percent.

Mrs. DiNello explained that there are a number of challenges within the business office and budget development. The current contract for generation of electricity is expiring in December and administration wants to enter into another contract to get good prices for electricity; however, there are so many unknowns at this point. She believed that this was going to be a benefit and savings to the Board of Education, but trying to determine what our utilization

is going to be over the next two to four years is challenging because of the savings with solar, the current energy management program with NORESKO, how it is being phased-in over a long period of time, and the two middle school construction projects. The challenge is what the actual savings would be with all of these things taken into consideration for our budget.

Mrs. Johnson asked about the security of the solar array at South End Elementary School because it is in a public park. Mr. Chester replied that this system is 263 kilowatts and, in terms of ground space, it is about one acre. It will be fenced in and, if they feel it necessary, they could look into putting in surveillance. Typically, it is a lockable fence about six or eight feet.

Mr. Goralski reiterated that these are town properties and that the town has entered into this contract. He asked that Greenskies makes the educational component a piece of each school project.

b. Covanta Presentation *(Moved from Agenda Item 10.a)*

Mrs. Smith explained that Covanta Energy presented a proposal to the Town Council on May 27, 2014 for construction of a regional organics recycling facility of food items and paper products from our school cafeterias and making it an educational connection.

Mr. Tom Cipolla, Covanta Municipal Services Manager, and Ms. Mary Ruder, who works in the Municipal Services Group working with municipalities on their organics efforts, gave a PowerPoint presentation. Mr. Cipolla pointed out that Covanta Energy has serviced Southington's municipal solid waste for 20-25 years at their renewable energy facilities in the state. They expanded their waste services in organic waste recycling and have partnered with a company called Turning Earth. He explained that Turning Earth is developing an anaerobic digestion organic waste facility in the town of Southington that will be up and running in 2015. Mr. Cipolla hoped that Southington would become the first community in the state of Connecticut to recycle its organic waste in the school system.

Some of the highlights of the PowerPoint presentation as explained by Mr. Cipolla and Ms. Ruder were:

- The Waste Management Hierarchy
- Bundled Services
- Organic Waste Recycling
- Connecticut Organics Project Overview
- What is Anaerobic Digestion
- Organic Waste Life Cycle
- Benefits from Recycled Organics
- Acceptable Organic Waste
- Covanta's Goals for Southington's Organic Board of Education Waste Disposal
- Implementing an Organics Recycling Program for the Southington Board of Education
- Student Involvement, Establishing Student Advocates, Making the Recycling an Education Opportunity
- Cost Savings
- Working closely with the Southington Food Service Employees
- Sorting Stations, Containers, Locations, Loading Docks

Mr. Cipolla explained that Covanta formed a partnership with the Center for EcoTechnology (CET) and introduced Ms. Heather Billings from CET. He explained that CET specializes in Waste Reduction Programs for municipalities. Ms. Billings stated that she was one of the Green Business Specialists at the Center for EcoTechnology and that she helps implement programs. Some of the highlights of her PowerPoint presentation were:

- CET is a non-profit organization established in 1976.
- They have three locations in Massachusetts and are expanding to Connecticut
- They provide practical solutions in the area of energy efficiency and waste reduction for business, schools and institutions.
- The Green Team Program, which is an environmental club for students and teacher.
- Food Waste Diversion in Schools and an environmental education opportunity.
- Best Management Practices in the kitchen, dining area, loading dock, preventing pests.
- The process: Gathering information from each school, involving administration, custodians, food service, and students in planning the program, waste assessment, training and implementation, and follow-up.

Mr. Goralski asked what Covanta would need from the Board. He understands that this would be a great opportunity to educate the students about saving the planet and improving the community. He noted that municipalities are excluded from legislation in Connecticut. He questioned what would be the Board of Education's incentive, reasoning, and why this would not cost the Board of Education anything.

Mr. Cipolla thought that they could get the program up and running for the Southington Public Schools in September. They would need a brief visit to the schools to understand the layout. They would recommend locations for containers, types of containers to capture the material, where to put the proper signage, and work with administration to communicate this to the stakeholders involved in the process. The bottom line is the disposal rate for organic waste is going to be less than the town is paying for its trash. There may be some additional costs for some containers. They can talk to the haulers and propose hauling prices.

Mr. Goralski commented that the concern would be educating students on day one and costs. He thought that Covanta was incredibly ambitious to have a plan in place with the staff for September as the students are not now in school and the staff is minimal in our buildings. He was excited for the program. He thought a mid-year implementation with some planning with staff would be more reasonable and achievable. Ms. Ruder felt that they could do it in phases. In Phase I, in September, they could begin it with the Food Service staff and then mid-year to start it with the students. The Anaerobic Digestion facility is not built yet, but will run 24/7 when it is completed. In order to operate, they need the feedstock, which is the organic waste.

Mrs. Notar-Francesco asked when the facility would be up and running. Ms. Ruder replied that the drop-dead date is January 2016. Mrs. Notar-Francesco wanted to know where they would be putting all the materials that they would be hauling out of the schools. Ms. Ruder replied that they would be going to a renewable energy plant and combust that and turn it into electricity as they do now. Mrs. Notar-Francesco suggested that Covanta works through administration and find out what timeline would work best for the Board of Education. Mr.

Goralski added that the Director of Food Service would have to play a key role in these decision-making processes.

Mr. Oshana thought that it was a great program; however, he gets nervous when he hears that Southington would be the first site in Connecticut to do this and to work out the kinks. He thought that September was too ambitious and that sustaining a program, putting it into place, and educating people was very difficult. He would like to see it happen, but thought that there needed to be a lot more work with administration.

Mrs. Queen was 100% behind this; however, she did not see how it could start in September. She was confused because she is hearing three companies, Turning Earth, Covanta, and the Center for EcoTechnology and questioned who was doing what and how these interact with each other. Mr. Goralski added that there is another organic recycling facility being built in Southington unrelated to Covanta. Mr. Cipolla stated that the school system would work with Covanta Energy as they have for the solid waste for the past 20 years. Turning Earth is the company that is building the organic Anaerobic Digestion facility. Covanta has a partnership agreement with Turning Earth to provide them the feedstock from towns like Southington to their facility. The contract would be with Covanta as it is today. CET is the organization that Covanta partnered with to help provide them with the expertise in implementing these programs within the schools.

Mr. Goralski noted that the Board would have to pay a third hauler and that no one yet has addressed costs to the Board of Education. He liked the program, but needed more details. Mr. Cipolla replied that was why Covanta needed approval for the next step, which is to see the schools to better understand the volumes, equipment required, and the layout and then they would be able to provide the Board with a proposal with financial terms.

Mrs. Lombardi stated that she was hearing a proposal to do something, but she does not understand the implementation, the process, the roles and responsibilities of all the parties, the commitment to the output each of the parties are going to provide the Board, and what the implications are to the school district staff; e.g., who is going to clean-up the spills. She felt that there was not enough information for the Board to make a decision.

Mrs. Smith explained that this was the third presentation that she has heard and that it does take a while to see how the pieces all fit together. She felt that, conceptually, recycling organics was a good thing, and that it was the direction in which to head. Mrs. Smith suggested that the administration bring back to the Board a specific recommendation with specific details addressing all of the issues outlined tonight. She commended the presentation because it is complex and it is new language for those people who are not a part of this industry. She asked for a consensus that recycling organics was definitely something that the Board would like to pursue. Mrs. Smith would like all departments at central office to work together and formulate for the Board a better, tighter plan. They would do the work behind the scenes with Covanta and their partners and bring to the Board a more concise plan. Mrs. Notar-Francesco added that it would have to be on administration's own timeline. Mr. Oshana did not want to be the school system that fails. Mrs. Smith replied that she and Mrs. DiNello had an idea and would work on that.

Mr. Goralski thought that Covanta was looking for whether the Board would be interested in pursuing this program this evening. He noted that the Board supported educating

the students in recycling. However, what they need now is for Covanta to coordinate the details through administration, look at the school facilities, and give the associated costs.

Mrs. Lombardi asked Covanta how they make money. Ms. Ruder replied that they are a business and they do make money. However, the difference is going to be for the town and what the Board is currently paying per ton for the tip fee for the regular trash. They are going to remove the food waste from that trash, which is typically the heaviest portion of waste. Mrs. Lombardi asked if Covanta was reselling the energy that they would produce from the waste. Ms. Ruder replied that was correct and that Turning Earth would do the same thing. It is a renewable source of energy. She noted that Lake Compounce was the first in Connecticut to initiate this and that the implementation went smoothly with two training sessions. They began the process in February and implemented it in June.

c. Technology Planning

Mrs. Smith welcomed Mr. Jason Ghidini and Mr. Steve Madancy, who are members of the Technology Committee, and Mrs. Karen Veilleux, Director of Technology. Mrs. Veilleux explained that they were charged with developing a plan for technology that would give equitable access to all students in the district. She thanked the committee for their time and effort in meeting bi-weekly to put this plan together, especially Chris Richter, Steve Lepage and Steve Madancy.

Mrs. Veilleux began the PowerPoint presentation on the Technology Long-Term Plan highlighting the following:

- Committee membership
- Policies regarding BYOD
- Instructional Data Management Software

Mr. Goralski stated that the Board would be happy if she addressed here the Instructional Management/Assessment Software (Agenda Item 10.f) within the Technology Long-Term Planning presentation.

Mrs. Veilleux explained that Mrs. Smith, Mr. John Duffy, Mrs. Stephanie Lawlor, Ms. Dale Riedinger, Mr. Steve Madancy and herself researched different software applications that would work best in the school district. After research and vendor presentations, it was determined that Pearson's Schoolnet would best fit Southington's needs to store assessment data over time and to design our own assessments. Schoolnet works seamlessly with PowerSchool because they are both Pearson products. Schoolnet offers the actual creation of the assessments. Mrs. Veilleux explained in detail everything that the Schoolnet software offers to equip students with the skills that they will need in a global economy. Mrs. Veilleux pointed out that \$37,083 was budgeted and, because Schoolnet is a specialized piece of software, she requested that the bidding process be waived in order to go forward with Schoolnet.

Mrs. Notar-Francesco asked Mrs. DiNello where the additional funds would come from. Mrs. DiNello replied that at the last Finance Committee meeting they hoped that they would be able to fund the second payment on the Time and Attendance System, which is in next year's budget for \$16,000. The plan is to frontload that in the 2013-2014 budget to free up those dollars to put towards the Schoolnet software, if the Board endorses that. They will look within other

line items during the summer with staff turnover to come back to the Finance Committee with an additional transfer request.

MOTION: by Mrs. Notar-Francesco, seconded by Mrs. Lombardi:

“Move that the Board of Education waives the bidding process to allow the Purchasing Department to purchase this software through Pearson.”

Mr. Derynoski questioned the funding. Mrs. DiNello explained that there was \$37,000 budgeted and they have an additional \$16,000 from the Time and Attendance System giving them \$53,000 towards that cost. Mrs. Notar-Francesco clarified that they are looking for approximately \$10,000 towards that cost from another line item. Mr. Derynoski was uncomfortable spending money that they do not have because there was not a line item for those funds. Mr. Goralski pointed out that they have it through the transfer of funds from another line item. Mrs. DiNello agreed with Mr. Derynoski that they have a lot of unknowns as they enter into the new school year and the Finance Committee knows a number of items that they have yet to lock into for 2014-2015. However, there is an established practice of holding back some of the supply line items. She was very happy with the percentage that they received for the Special Education reimbursement for Excess Costs. She felt that, with their budget size and the fluidity that happens during the school year, she would determine a way to fund the additional cost for this important software.

Mrs. Lombardi added that Dr. Murdica just left the school system and they do not have that position filled right now. She felt that the salary for one month would be enough to cover the \$10,000 and free up some of the money. Mrs. Notar-Francesco agreed. Mr. Derynoski stated that it does not sound like a lot of money when there is an \$80 million dollar budget, but he would feel more comfortable if the Board said they would take that money from the 25% held back and earmark that as a reduction so they know, in advance of spending money, where it was coming from. Mrs. DiNello added that there was an adjustment in math textbooks due to unavailability and the Board transferred half of the money allocated (\$40,000 in algebra textbooks) to purchase the consumable texts that would be needed. It would leave \$20,000 in the New Textbook line item that would not be earmarked and could also be used for the software purchase.

Mr. Goralski agreed and requested to add to the motion to reallocate the textbook funds instead of the supply funds.

AMENDED MOTION: by Mrs. Notar-Francesco, seconded by Mrs. Lombardi:

“Move that the Board of Education waives the bidding process to allow the Purchasing Department to purchase this software through Pearson and reallocate funds from the textbook line item to cover the difference in this cost.”

Mrs. Johnson questioned Mr. Madancy on the teacher utilization of the Pearson software and how user-friendly it was. Mr. Madancy replied that it was the INFORM software that he had experience with, which was the original presentation that the Technology Committee presented to the Board. However, they found that Schoolnet was much more comprehensive than INFORM, which is a barebones database that communicates seamlessly through PowerSchool

just like Schoolnet. The advantage of Schoolnet to teachers is how comprehensive it is. Mr. Madancy gave some examples. He felt that teachers would welcome the online assessment component.

Mr. Goralski and Mrs. Lombardi added that Southington was way behind in supplying technology to utilize data. Mr. Oshana asked what process they would have in place to follow-up to ensure that it was being used properly. Mrs. Veilleux responded that it would not be live in September for everything, and it takes time to build this up. The process would involve training, inputting data, how the teachers can access the data, and how the math, science and language arts coordinators would be pulling that data. Mr. Oshana asked who would be managing it to make sure that the imported data was consistent. Mrs. Smith replied that was the position she planned to include in the 2015-2016 budget because there needs to be an Instructional Data Management person whose task is to focus only on data management and student achievement from the instructional point of view. In the interim, they will have the technology staff, under Mrs. Veilleux's leadership, input baseline data. It will take at least half a year to input this information.

ROLL CALL VOTE – YES: Mrs. Queen, Mrs. Clark, Mr. Derynoski, Mrs. Johnson, Mrs. Lombardi, Mrs. Notar-Francesco, Mr. Oshana, Mr. Goralski.

Motion carried unanimously 8-0.

Mr. Goralski asked Mrs. Veilleux to continue her PowerPoint presentation from Agenda Item 10.c. "Technology Planning." Mrs. Veilleux continued to address the following:

- Staff Survey Analysis
- BYOD (Bring Your Own Device) versus 1:1 pros and cons
- Parent Survey Analysis (Grades 6 - 11)
- Student Survey Analysis
- Technology Development
- Infrastructure Upgrade
- Professional Development including Google training with Carol Larow and Southington Public Schools "Teachology" with real world tutorials
- Recommendations on moving forward

Mr. Goralski was disappointed in the number of teachers who did not partake in the staff survey that was very important to their work as well as the percentage of teachers who classify themselves as beginner technology teachers. Mrs. Veilleux pointed out that it was the recently renovated schools that have the most upgraded technology versus the schools that do not. She pointed out that the elementary teachers all have a laptop provided by the district that they use at school and at home and they always have their device with them. If you give them a device that they use for everything, they will use it. Through the building projects, the middle schools will be getting laptops and the high school will be getting them this summer through the Apple lease.

Mrs. Veilleux explained that some parents are apprehensive about sending their child to school with the family-owned device because it might be damaged or stolen. She noted that 75% of the parents who responded to the Parent Survey were willing to accept the responsibility of a school-owned device and 44% who would like to have an insurance option provided through the district.

Mrs. Veilleux stated that, in weighing the pros and cons of BYOD vs. 1:1, overall the pros of the 1:1 initiative outweighed the Bring Your Own Device option. She noted that the Bring Your Own Devices (BYOD) could not be used for state testing.

Mrs. Veilleux discussed the Alta Chromebooks 1:1 pilot that overall was very successful and increased student engagement across all content areas. They also did Mini-Chromebook Pilots at the high school in a Marketing Class (Grades 9-11) and one at Kennedy Middle School with Mr. Ghidini. There was 100% participation in both classes. Mr. Ghidini spoke to the Board about some of his observations while doing the pilot, and noted that in all his years teaching this was the most excited he has seen students when they received their Chromebooks. He used Google Docs and put all the homework online, which he did six times with 100% completion of the homework that he has never had in all his years teaching. The students could no longer use the excuse that they lost it. He also noted that the students were very protective and territorial with their Chromebooks.

Mrs. Queen complimented the Technology Committee on the comprehensive report. She questioned the BYOD versus the 1:1 devices and needed to be convinced on the 1:1 because many students have the BYOD device in their pocket or backpack and in their homes. She felt that everything in the future would be mobile. She questioned the Chromebook becoming obsolete and the replacement cycle, and not eliminating the BYOD as a policy, but having a hybrid model as opposed to one or the other.

Mrs. Veilleux felt that most of the middle and high school students have cell phones. However, there are some things that do not work well on that type of device, such as reading long papers or writing, which was a consideration discussed in the committee. Mr. Ghidini added that in the committee's information gathering they found that with district-provided devices they have better accessibility with firewalls, virus protection, etc., that they don't get with the BYOD. They found through the survey that with the BYOD device the parents sometimes want to use the family laptop and the students are saying they need it to do their homework.

Mrs. Notar-Francesco stated that she was not sold on the 1:1 device either because for a district the size of Southington it could be very expensive to outfit every student with a device. She was concerned with how they were tracking the devices that they are giving out to make sure there was not any loss. Mrs. Veilleux replied that they asset tag everything and track it with the students and parents signing an agreement that they were responsible for damage. By state statute, they are allowed to withhold certain things such as grades and transcripts in order to collect those fees. It would be considered an educational device, just like a textbook. She noted that an insurance policy was an option.

Mrs. Clark commented on the inequality with the BYOD that she has heard from talking with parents. She liked the 1:1 device because everyone is on the same page.

Mrs. Lombardi has been reading that school districts were not going specifically to one device or the other and that they were doing a combination of the two depending on the subject and the grade level.

Mr. Oshana felt that this needed to go back to the Policy Committee because that committee started this and then put it on hold to wait for the Technology report to come out. He liked the 1:1 concept because it has equity and is standard, which would make the education process easier. Mr. Oshana asked how they would deal with privacy issues because Google owns everything that goes on Google products. Mrs. Veilleux replied that, because of a recent lawsuit, Google said that they are not going through education accounts to scan the data any more. Mrs. Veilleux would like our attorneys to give a workshop on the privacy issues.

Mrs. Johnson addressed Mr. Ghidini and questioned the durability of the devices and how the children were handling them. Mr. Ghidini replied that the students were very protective of their devices. He noted that each Chromebook came with a blue case that was durable, and the students keep their device in it. Mrs. Johnson asked if the Chromebooks use Wi-Fi and what happens when they take it home. Mrs. Veilleux responded that the Chromebooks use Wi-Fi and can be used in an offline mode, too. Also, Wi-Fi can be accessed in the public libraries.

Mrs. Lombardi stated that she would like to see more measurements in terms of the area of utilization of technology by the teachers. She asked that Mrs. Veilleux bring back that information to the Board. Mrs. Veilleux responded that after the August professional development she would do another teacher survey.

Mr. Goralski asked Mrs. Veilleux to research if there are districts that require their students to bring their own devices and how they help the students that cannot. He thought that would be the best hybrid to the BYOD situation. Mrs. Veilleux replied that she knows of schools that are charging a technology fee, such as a pay to play for sports. Mrs. Veilleux added that the Chromebook device that they are looking at costs \$279.99. Mr. Goralski asked if the school district would get a discount if they bought 8,000 Chromebooks and then the district could sell them to the parents. It would be really simple to see what the economy of scale could save the district. Mrs. Queen agreed with Mr. Goralski and questioned if it would be reasonable to ask parents to be responsible for paying for the technology for their child.

d. Middle School Media / Technology Integration Specialist ~ Second Reading

MOTION: by Mrs. Clark, seconded by Mrs. Queen:

“Move to approve the job description for Middle School Media / Technology Integration Specialist, as recommended by the Policy and Personnel Committee.”

Motion carried unanimously by voice vote 8 – 0.

- e. Appointment of Director of Operations (*Moved to Agenda Item 6.b*)**
- f. Instructional Management / Assessment Software (*merged with Agenda Item 10.c “Technology Planning”*)**
- g. Obsolete Textbooks**

Mrs. Smith stated that she answered questions from Board members that surfaced earlier this week and today regarding the obsolete textbooks. Mrs. Johnson appreciated Mrs. Smith’s earlier responses, but had more questions and apologized for waiting until tonight. She noted

that in science for the middle schools the book Earth's Changing Surface was being replaced by Earth Changing Surface Interactive. She asked Mrs. Smith what that meant. Mrs. Smith replied that she would find out and get back to Mrs. Johnson on Friday. Mrs. Johnson questioned at the middle school level why the book Adventures of Tom Sawyer was obsolete and no longer used. Mrs. Smith replied that the conditions of many of the books are beyond repair and could not be rebound. Mrs. Johnson noted that the 363 Collegiate Dictionaries at the high school were dated 2005 and asked if they were no longer using dictionaries at the high school. Mrs. Smith replied that she would find out the specifics and get back to Mrs. Johnson on Friday. Mrs. Johnson thought that, in the future, all the books that were dated fairly recently and had large scale book turnovers should have some rationale included. She recommended that it go through the Curriculum & Instruction Committee. Mrs. Smith explained that some vendors delivered samples to schools in packets that don't match what is being taught. She also explained that the reason the list from DePaolo Middle School is so long was due to the construction project and that they went through all the closets and cleaned them out.

Mr. Goralski requested justification for any book that was under 10 years old and why it was on the obsolete textbook list. Mrs. Smith replied that she would do that.

MOTION: by Mr. Derynoski, seconded by Mrs. Notar-Francesco:

"Move to Table."

Motion carried unanimously by voice vote 8 – 0.

Mr. Goralski stated that the Obsolete Textbooks would return as an agenda item in July.

11. ADJOURNMENT

MOTION: by Mr. Derynoski, seconded by Mr. Oshana:

"Move to adjourn."

Motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

The meeting adjourned at 10:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Linda Blanchard
Recording Secretary



Southington High School

720 Pleasant Street • Southington, CT 06489

Phone: (860) 628-3229

Fax: (860) 628-3397

Home Page: www.southingtonschools.org

Attachment #1

Martin J. Semmel, Ed.D

Assistant Principals

Helen A. Crowley

Michael P. Halloran

Brian R. Stranieri

Richard J. Terino

Date: 5/13/14

To: Karen Smith

From: Rick Terino

Re: grade 9 team leader stipend

Consistent with the middle school teaming concept, I am requesting a second grade 9 team leader stipend at the cost of \$1,417.00. Thus, this second grade 9 pilot academic team would operate with the same hierarchy as its counterpart. The teacher appointed to this position would report to the grade 9 administrator and would have the following job responsibilities:

- o Establish daily team meeting written agendas
- o Facilitate team meetings
- o Maintain record of team meeting minutes
- o Coordinates interdisciplinary units of study within the team
- o Serve as team liaison to student support services (i.e., counselor, nurse, social worker, etc.)
- o Oversee team case management of team's EIP students and serve as liaison to grade 9 EIP team
- o Assume leadership for analysis of individual team students' progress
- o Compile student unsatisfactory progress report on team subjects and communicate to administration and counselor twice per marking term
- o Serve as contact person for parent/guardian regarding team communication
- o Coordinate and schedule parent/guardian conferences other than special education or 504 meetings
- o Create and maintain parent/guardian email folder for bulk communication
- o Chief editor of team e-newsletter
- o Facilitate planning of team-wide enrichment
- o Any other tasks and responsibilities as assigned by administration.

C: Dr. Semmel