

**CITY OF BRIDGEPORT  
EDUCATION AND SOCIAL SERVICES COMMITTEE  
APRIL 13, 2010**

ATTENDANCE: Denese Taylor-Moye, Co-Chair; M. Evette Brantley, Co-Chair; Andre Baker; Lydia Martinez; Richard Bonney (6:15 p.m.) Robert Walsh (6:23 p.m.)

STAFF: Paul Timpanelli, President CEO, Bridgeport Regional Business Council  
Robert Henry, Chief of Staff, BOE

OTHER Council Members: Angel M. dePara, Leticia Colon, Carlos Silva, Michelle Lyons, Susan Brannelly, Thomas McCarthy (6:40 p.m.)

Call to Order

Ms. Taylor-Moye called the meeting to order at 6:05 p.m. and introduced the committee members in attendance as listed above.

Approval of Committee Minutes of January 13, 2010.

\*\* MS. M. EVETTE BRANTLEY MOTIONED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF JANUARY 13, 2010.  
\*\* MS. MARTINEZ SECONDED.  
\*\* MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

**Public Information Session:**

Status Gibson Report from Bridgeport Regional Business Council on Partnership for  
Bridgeport Education Accountability and Transparency Project.

Ms. Taylor-Moye reviewed the procedure for conducting the public information session and asked those who planned to speak to limit comments only as relevant to the report as presented, and she asked individuals to hold questions and comments until after the report was presented. Ms. Taylor-Moye introduced Paul Timpanelli, President CEO, Bridgeport Regional Business Council, and asked him to present the Gibson Report.

Mr. Richard Bonney entered the meeting at 6:15 p.m.

Mr. Timpanelli distributed copies of the report to the Committee members and stated that the Bridgeport Regional Business Council had engaged Gibson Consulting Group, Inc. to perform a brief overview of existing operational and management systems to identify possible efficiencies and cost savings for Bridgeport Public Schools.

Mr. Timpanelli presented the highlights of the 50 page report and stated that the next steps were to present the report to the Board of Education Finance Committee, then on to the Council and the Mayor.

Mr. Robert Walsh entered the meeting at 6:23 p.m.

*The following comments are not verbatim and represent a summarization of questions and statements made in regard to the Gibson Report.*

Mr. Baker asked about the Facilities Usage recommendations as listed on page 18 and questioned the implications, timing, and costs involved. Mr. Timpanelli responded that the consultant would have brainstorming sessions with the Board of Education to implement what is decided upon and the proposed timing would be twelve months and \$1 million to implement the three phases each would be three-six months after approval.

Ms. Martinez asked what the approval process was with meeting with the Council, and Mr. Timpanelli responded that he would go wherever directed, but they are scheduled to meet with the Finance Committee, then the Board of Education and the Mayor.

Ms. Bromley asked about the statement about top heavy staffing and if there was a perception that this was by number, by dollars spend in administrative salaries, or if this was based on number of principals or assistants. Mr. Timpanelli replied that this was a non-classroom number and that actually the report states that there is a shortage of principals.

Mr. Baker stated that the report is lengthy and hard to digest in a short time and it should have been distributed in advance to allow the Committee members time to study and respond. He added that he questioned if there was any study on new buildings for the schools, and Mr. Timpanelli responded that this did not take new building construction plans into account, that this was an operational study of day to day procedures and operations to find savings.

Mr. Walsh asked what the “comparable” school systems were that the report was based on and if they were in the Northeast or in mid-west, as that would be an important factor for comparison. Mr. Timpanelli stated that mostly likely it was based on geographical, urban characteristics, and like size relationships, but he did not have that exact information, but there should be a better definition of what systems were used for comparison. Mr. Walsh asked if there were union approval considerations and Mr. Timpanelli responded that it is a new game compared to “old days” and this would be based on union renegotiations.

Ms. Lyons stated that some of the recommendations make sense but are not in line with the culture and could be too contradictory to the customs of the City school system, along with legal reasons that should be investigated.

Mr. dePara stated that it would be helpful for the consultant to have a detail support person in attendance when they give the presentation to be able to answer the technical and detail questions.

Ms. Brantley stated that there should be a joint Board of Education Common Council meeting so that all could ask the questions that many will have the same questions and they should be discussions with all involved and work together to study the report.

Ms. Brannelly asked if the integration with the City and Board of Education services was a consideration, and if things like grant writing and purchasing areas of duplication were taken into account. Mr. Timpanelli replied that Phase I of the report does take into account duplication of services, and that with the implementation of certain recommendations, phase IV could do even more.

Ms. Colon asked if areas of transportation, such as crossing guards, were examined within City guidelines, and Mr. Henry replied that some crossing guard services come under the City Transportation or Police Department areas or jurisdiction and that the City ordinances and charter would have to be reviewed to determine who enforces the crossing guards beyond school property.

Ms. Martinez stated that she really likes the report and that it was important for the different groups within the City work together, and they have an opportunity to produce a good outcome if they work together.

Ms. Robles stated that the report does answer future building of schools on page 38, and that the section that addresses the findings on top heavy administration is on page 36.

Mr. Baker asked if there was any priority of the recommendations, and Mr. Timpanelli answered that on page 38 the areas of facilities, bell schedules, payroll procedures, and purchasing requisitions would be priority areas.

Mr. Thomas McCarthy entered the meeting at 6:40 p.m.

Ms. Brantley made the recommendation that the Committee meet with the Gibson Group after the Council meets with them on Monday, and that Tuesday evening would be a good day to schedule a meeting to further review the presentation. She added that the onus relies on the Board of Education to make decisions on what recommendations to accept and they must work together with the Council.

Mr. McCarthy thanked all those who came out for this public information session, and added that there is not one simple solution, but a list of recommendations that will be carefully evaluated. He added that all members involved should take a long hard look at the plan, and that it is a modern miracle that the Board of Education and Council are scheduled to work together on a plan to improve the City school systems.

Ms. Taylor-Moye stated that there would be an e-mail meeting announcement with the details of the time and location of the Tuesday evening to further review the presentation. She added that this was the first step in the review process, and the Committee relies on the Board of Education to make decisions on the recommendations to accept and implement the report.

ADJOURNMENT

\*\* MS. BRANTLEY MOTIONED TO ADJOURN.  
\*\* MS. MARTINEZ SECONDED.  
\*\* MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

The meeting adjourned at 6:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Marilyn Knox,  
Telesco Secretarial Services