

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

Minutes of SABIS Board of Trustees Meeting – April 28, 2020
Contract Committee
via conference call

In Attendance: Atu White, Luis Aponte, Joyce Gondek, Ellen McDonald, Patrick White, Freddy Lopez, Paula Meara, Anne-Marie Nicolai

Guests: Maretta Thomsen, Vanessa Pileggi

Not Present: Daryl Johnson

I. Meeting called to order at 6:05 p.m.

II. **Contract Review**

Atu White updated the committee on the contract work:

Business Manager

Governance committee met yesterday and recommendation was to remove the potential item that business manager reports directly to the Board out of the bylaws draft. The committee thought it was best at this time to go that way. It would require much more time and mean rewriting bylaws, attorney review, etc.

Student Outcomes

Atu White met with Amy Wesley today for review. Benchmark will switch from AMS being the standard and looking to reach 80%. They are looking at end-of-year reporting; their proposal is summarized on page 3. From the end of year one to end of next year will achieve 5% gain in overall student results in grades 3-8 for students who have been enrolled three or more consecutive years, held accountable for 5% gain but will strive for 8% gain. The starting point for each student is different. Example asked/what if a student went from a 60 to 67 then 62/how to track? Recommended across the board per grade level instead of individual students; also recommended including all students not just students enrolled three or more years; and 10-point gain year over year. Amy Wesley said she spoke with Carl Bistany and there is no movement on their end on this item. Education committee attending here tonight to help review the component of student outcomes within the contract which is tied to remuneration and holdback for clear definitions in contract.

Example for conversation, if Board agreed to 5% per year increases, think about how to address the other components such as the three years enrolled, or address where is actual starting point and grade level; and is it accumulating 5 points per year? Some committee questions: would we be looking at where we are currently? 5% from where are now even though not meeting original benchmarks?--yes. Defer to education committee. Committee agrees, it seems like two completely different systems. Patrick White noted that the education committee has reviewed for at least a year, and rest of board can see it's not about the "results" but about the financial compensation that the management company receives and it is not helping kids in reference to rewarding--we would still be considered "not meeting expectations" per DESE. For the students "enrolled three or more years", do students need to take a placement test? Maretta Thomsen said students are given a diagnostic test when they come in; goal has always been to take students where they are. If needed they can be placed with an interventionist, use multi-tiered approach find out what concepts they do not know and instruct them to get them point they belong. Patrick White said that if kids are placed in grade where the school feels they need to be, we should not utilize the "enrolled for three or more years" language. Ellen McDonald also noted there are plenty of resources in place to address shortcomings. Looking at 8% in grades 3-8; number is so small should not impact results that much. Paula Meara also deferred to education committee but does not want to see unnecessary pressure on kids who are struggling; also has concern for not being on-line for students for about a month.

Should the number be based on individual growth percent or across grade level? DESE report does contain subgroups but not individuals. Suggested to mirror DESE. Consensus was to track as group, not individually.

SEM perspective the 5% is realistic and based on pedagogical practice. Atu White read a statement from Amy Wesley about student outcomes. If we accept the 5% where does that place us as a school and how DESE will review in 2022 and beyond? What will it look like in three years? Anne-Marie Nicolai/it is not enough for where the school needs to be for DESE; how is it a good educational benchmark? It does not seem like a difficult goal to reach if at 5%. Ellen McDonald read some examples from 9th grade numbers. Where is the starting point? Is it the SEM position that 80% = meets or exceeds on external tests? Atu White said that the starting point is the EOY results from June 2019. Current proposal does not have 80% as a standard/what is starting point? Get more external help establishing baseline and percentage more in compliance with DESE? Note their primary focus will be next gen MCAS. Apply what DESE offers to 80%, if need five points per year to get there, whatever it will take, in order to meet DSE requirements. Ellen McDonald will draft email to DESE, and Atu White will speak to Amy Wesley with 80% as baseline.

Renumeration

Regarding the fee, SEM wishes to "split the difference" for a 2,412,000 request. \$2.7M was requested and he returned with 12% per current which would be \$2.3M. FREDDY

asked for more info/ have not heard back from other schools in order to compare to confirm 12% is reasonable benchmark. Was it originally something SEM charged across all their schools? Need more data in order for comparison; such as how does SABIS rate for fees compare with other management companies?

Gather info by Friday to respond to \$2.4 number. Holdback suggested 11% last week, could end up at 10%. Other piece is that SEM wants holdback to accrue year to year; they do not want it tied to DESE; they want it tied to student outcomes. So basically they want the \$240K in a holdback. Consider accruing for two years to give DESE opportunity to review/ but what if significant improvement has not been achieved? Should be released back to operating budget and eval month to month basis.

Ellen McDonald will draft note to find out what they're looking for. Committee would not recommend it accrues; cannot go back several months. Should be as it is now, equitable and fair, held until condition is reassessed.

Atu White to reach out to attorney.

Committee will meet again May 5 at 6:00 p.m.

Patrick White moved to adjourn the meeting. Seconded by Paula Meara. The meeting adjourned at 7:17 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Anne-Marie Nicolai, Secretary
SICS Board of Trustees