

**The SABIS International Charter School
160 Joan Street
Springfield, MA 01129
Board of Trustees**

Minutes of SABIS Board of Trustees Meeting – March 24, 2020
Education Committee
via conference call

In Attendance: Committee members Ellen McDonald, Anne-Marie Nicolai, Patrick White, Joyce Gondek; and board members Sonja Shaw, Atu White, Paula Meara

Guests: Vanessa Pileggi, Amy Wesley, Maretta Thomsen

Not Present: n/a

I. **Meeting called to order at 6:00 p.m.**

II. **Review Contract Benchmarks**

SEM provided a list of items to remove or modify as provided by Atu White in his email of 3/19/2020. Everyone has a copy of the management contract. Items were as follows:

1. We suggest rewording or removing the Student Outcomes that have changed because federal or state legislation have changed. These include:

a. Reword “proficient/advanced” under Maintaining the success of high school students to “meets or exceeds.”

b. Reword “median” to “mean” under Increase overall student performance. “The goal shall be for SICS to obtain and maintain a “mean” student growth percentile (SGP) of 50 or higher in the aggregate as reported on DESE’s School Report Card.”

c. Remove the following because PPT and Leveled statuses no longer exist: “SICS shall maintain a cumulative PPT for all students and for high needs students of 75 or higher in order to maintain Level 1 status. Where PPIs are below 75 for either group of students, SICS shall show improvement of the cumulative PPT from year to year.

d. Remove the following because Leveled status no longer exists: “The School and SEM recognize the importance of the School achieving Level 1 status and the SEM agrees to use its best efforts toward having the School achieve Level 1 status by the end of the third (3rd) year of this five (5) year charter...”

2. Remove SABIS® Academic Monitoring System (AMS) mastery of 80% in English, math, and science as a measure of SABIS performance under Student Outcomes. AMS is a formative assessment, and I do not believe it should be used as a measure of student performance or progress. AMS is used to assess ongoing instruction and identify areas of re-teaching in advance of summative assessments such as Periodic Exams or end-of-term exams. We would be open to

discussing an alternative measure such as end-of term results to gauge student outcomes.

3. *Remove the financial hold-back for performance.*

4. *Add language to section 2.3.1, paragraph 2, that inserts language calling for a requirement that any school evaluation must be based on objective data regarding performance.*

Item 1: Ellen McDonald referenced page 6 of contract, these are the first 3 bullets. Item (a) reword “proficient/advanced” to “meets or exceeds”. Suggestion to add grades 3-8 along with 10th grade students per the charter renewal doc. Change “MCAS” to “external testing”. (b) reword “median to mean”; noted that this falls under accountability section of DESE reports. Looks like DSE is reporting it as a mean; need to include caveat between high school and non-HS and note subgroups showing steady improvement. Change to “mean” as reported but be able to see subgroups. Anne-Marie Nicolai asked about adding benchmarks into contract for goals? Look at 15 “percent” (points) each year to get to the 95% in three years? (c) “PPT” item referenced could be removed but can review further. (d) Remove because “level 1” no longer exists / suggest minimum score of 75 by 12/31/2022. Pat White asked about clause that would allow board to go out for RFP or review options so that it is part of the contract; not that the Board would make a change but would give Board opportunity to meet obligations for the students. Contractual obligation if put in place, if not met in year two, for example. Atu White noted don’t have to do in contract an automatic option or renewal in contract. Can do five-year contract. Do not have to note after year 1, 2, or 3, etc. since the Board can do whenever it chooses. Reference item iv under “term” in contract, can edit as needed.

Item 2 Unsure why SEM wishes to remove? It was suggested to keep in as a performance reference. 80% realistic with 15-point yearly gain. Look at percentage above 80% in aggregate and come up with baseline number to work with, for all students. The 15-point gain would show an expectation of improvement year after year to be where we need to be in three years.

Ellen McDonald suggested under Reporting info to be provided to committee by 48 hours prior to the meeting. Referencing page 8. Proposed language. If two-day notice is not met, what is consequence?

Item 4 references page 8, 2.3.1, that evaluation must be based on objective data regarding performance. Does this exclude an independent party evaluation? Proposed BOT has right to conduct an objective school eval by objective third party education evaluation team selected by the trustees.

Item 3 “remove financial hold back for performance”, committee decided no. Consider amount; should holdback be increased? Is there confidence in curriculum? Concern if removed. Atu White noted that if the \$204K is a holdback, they would be entitled to receive it if benchmarks met, per current contract. Patrick White noted performance evaluation for Director – there was no Board approval of the Director, need to finalize in what direction; propose interview process. Review section about selection of Director

in contract. Noted that in every high performing school, the Director always reports to the Board. Joyce Gondek noted governance committee is also working with bylaws on this. Suggestion that Business Manager should also report to the Board. Ellen McDonald suggested that any financial pieces be reviewed by the finance committee. For example, there was trouble receiving information about monies paid out in the settlement. When the Board asks for something, it should receive the information, especially financial.

Paula Meara joined the meeting

Anne-Marie Nicolai asked about DESE requirement in sharing best practices; as educators would we like to go and look at schools that are in the high achieving category? Some even include lesson plans and invite visits.

Patrick White noted in the performance evaluation form— instead of seeing every single implementation, could note what was implemented and what was the benchmark. Ellen McDonald agreed/they could work on rewording. Education committee could look at the benchmarks and have ongoing conversation.

Ellen McDonald thanked Atu White and contract committee for including education committee in the discussion.

Amy Wesley asked to offer some information and Ellen suggested she review with contract committee.

Patrick White moved to adjourn the meeting. Seconded by Anne-Marie Nicolai. The meeting adjourned at 7:14 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Anne-Marie Nicolai, Secretary
SICS Board of Trustees

Attachments

n/a