

THE SCHOOL BOARD OF BROWARD COUNTY, FLORIDA
OFFICE OF THE SUPERINTENDENT

June 23, 2015
Tuesday, 10:15 a.m.

MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING

The School Board of Broward County, Florida, met in regular session at 10:19 a.m., Tuesday, June 23, 2015, in the Board Room of the Kathleen C. Wright Administrative Center, 600 Southeast Third Avenue, Fort Lauderdale, Florida. Present were: Donna P. Korn, Chair; Dr. Rosalind Osgood, Vice Chair (absent); Members Robin Bartleman (via teleconference), Heather P. Brinkworth, Abby M. Freedman, Patricia Good, Laurie Rich Levinson, Ann Murray, Nora Rupert; Robert W. Runcie, Superintendent; and J. Paul Carland, II, Esq.

Call to Order The Chair called the meeting to order. Principal Leena Itty and students from Hallandale Elementary School (appearing through video conference) led the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America.

At the request of the Superintendent, a moment of silence was taken for Scott Krutchik, Director, Accounting & Financial Reporting, who passed away unexpectedly.

Minutes for Approval Motion was made by Mrs. Rupert, seconded by Mrs. Brinkworth and carried, to approve the official minutes for the following Board Meetings: Dr. Osgood was absent. (8-0 vote)

May 19, 2015 - Regular School Board Meeting
June 9, 2015 - Special - Expulsions

Close Agenda Upon motion by Mrs. Rupert, seconded by Mrs. Brinkworth and carried, the Agenda was approved and declared closed. Dr. Osgood was absent. (8-0 vote)

Special Presentations

- Recognition of South Plantation High School JROTC Historic Normandy France D-Day Celebration
- Recognition of all the Partners Involved in the Third Annual Autism in Flight
- Recognition of McNab Elementary PTA and in Support of "McNab Family Fun Day"

These recognitions may be viewed in their entirety at:
<http://www.browardschools.com/School-Board/Special-Presentations>

Reports

The following reports were presented:

- Broward County Association of Student Councils and Student Advisor to the Board - Alexandria Khan, Student Advisor
Isaac Weiser, Alternate Student Advisor
- Facilities Task Force - Nathalie Lynch-Walsh, Chair

These reports may be viewed in their entirety at:

<https://becon223.eduvision.tv/Default.aspx?q=d0F7qPKKlcfmtjfULqo9AQ%3d%3d>
(Click on School Board Meeting 6-23-15.)

Ms. Korn asked the Superintendent when Derek Messier, Chief Facilities Officer, came to the last workshop with the information, it was her understanding that the Board would hear the information first from Mr. Messier and then he would share that information with the Facilities Task Force.

Mr. Runcie stated that was correct. Mr. Messier would be explaining it at the next Facilities Task Force meeting as he indicated.

Superintendent's Report

Mr. Runcie thanked the Greater Alliance of Fort Lauderdale and the *Sun-Sentinel* for the work they have done in celebrating the District's schools and the achievement of its students. He shared the recent advertisement this weekend (which was also projected on the screen and posted on the District's website, www.browardschools.com). The Public Information Office (PIO) and graphics team designed an ad that gave the community information about the District's high schools and high-quality education provided to its students. The ad showcased the incredible achievements of the District's high school graduates. The graduates worked hard, investing in their studies, and were preparing to enter some of the most prestigious colleges, universities, and military academies in this country. Everyone was very proud of all the graduates.

Mr. Runcie said the ad also highlighted the District's focus on Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math (STEM). Broward County was the first Florida district to partner with Code.org to offer computer science in all Broward County Public School (BCPS) high schools, with expansion to the elementary and middle schools as well. This ad emphasized the District's commitment to its students that are college and career ready, highlighting the 14,389 college courses completed by high school students through dual enrollment and early admission programs in 2015. In addition, over 35,000 advanced placement (AP) courses were completed by the District's high school students as well. All of the high schools provide advanced academic programs, allowing students to earn college credits in high school. Finally, this ad celebrates the achievements of the District's high schools earning such distinct honors as ranking among the country's best high schools by *U.S. News and World Report*, being recognized as leading high schools by *The Washington Post*, and named Magnet Schools of Distinction by The Magnet Schools of America. Mr. Runcie concluded by extending congratulations as the District celebrates the Class of 2015.

Speakers

Youssef Wardani
John Casbarro
Roderick Hagen
Nathalie Lynch-Walsh
Michael Sirbola
Mary Fertig
Rebecca Dahl

Mr. Runcie spoke to comments regarding the start of the work on the bond. There is a process that has to be followed to even secure the funds for the bond, which they have made very clear. A hurdle they had to go through after the voters approved bond was to go through a magistrate in February / March 2015 to validate the results and provide a period for public comment within thirty days. It was only last week that he and the Chair signed documents that allowed the District to receive funding for the first part of the bond, so the election does not happen and the next the funding is available. That is not how it works and has never been communicated that way. The timeline put forth, which is on the website for all the projects, is consistent and has always been communicated it was intended to start work this summer or early fall and they will continue to work towards that schedule. Pertaining to Stranahan High and Northeast High Schools, those two schools are at the top of the list. They share the same concerns for the schools.

Consent Agenda Following identification of those items Board Members and members of the public indicated they would like considered separately, motion was made by Mrs. Rupert, seconded by Mrs. Brinkworth and carried, to approve the Consent Agenda for the remaining items (**identified by ***). Dr. Osgood was absent. (8-0 vote)

CONSENT ITEMS

A. RESOLUTIONS

A-1. School Boundary Committee Resolution and 2016-2017 School Boundary Process Timeline (Adopted)

Motion was made by Mrs. Rupert, seconded by Mrs. Brinkworth and carried, to adopt Resolution 15-112 in support of establishing the formation and functions of the School Boundary Committee and adopt the proposed 2016-2017 School Boundary Process Timeline. Ms. Korn and Dr. Osgood were absent for the vote. (7-0 vote)

Section 1001.41 and 1001.42, Florida Statutes, give the Broward County School Board the power and duty of assigning students to schools. Therefore, the Broward County School Board, through the approval of the attached Resolution, shall create a School Boundary Committee to act as a District-wide advisory committee to the School Board to review any necessary or desirable changes to the school attendance areas.

The annual community School Boundary Process provides the opportunity for significant community input in an open and inclusive atmosphere. A review of this resolution has been completed and approved by Senior Leadership and District legal counsel.

The fiscal impact to the District will not exceed the funding already included in the Demographics & Student Assignments Department annual budget.

Mrs. Brinkworth received an email from one her community members with regards to the Resolution, page 2 of 5, Section 2. Membership, number 1). The way it was worded sounded like the SAF Chair cannot choose those two people, rather than a committee of SAF people coming together to elect them. She asked if that was the intention. In addition, for number 2), the way it was worded it said the Committee Representative and Alternate are recommended annually to the Area Advisory by the SAF Chairs from within each SAF. Mrs. Brinkworth asked how the SAF Chairs come about the recommendation; what was the process.

Leslie Brown, Chief Portfolio Services Officer, replied in number 1) it is the SAF Chairs that solicit Committee volunteers to represent the IZone, so the SAF Chairs would ask the committee members in the SAF to suggest and recommend names that the SAF Chair would bring forward to the District Area Advisory.

Mrs. Brinkworth said when she read it she thought the same thing; however, the person who asked her the question thought the SAF Chair would then go and ask two people, which would be different than having a room of people that have a conversation where two people volunteer from that conversation. Mrs. Brinkworth asked staff if they saw the difference and the perception issue.

Mrs. Brown agreed and stated they could review number 1) and clarify that that would be a vote by the SAF for those two representatives.

Mrs. Brinkworth said okay and asked how this would be handled to ensure each school had a functioning SAF.

Mrs. Brown replied a memo was sent before school ended to principals and the SAF Chair person, and based on this meeting and the previous workshop, they understood that the Board's intent was for this process to go through the SAF.

Mrs. Brinkworth did not understand how that would help if there was not a SAF at each school.

Mrs. Brown stated she would work with Service Quality in the Office of School Performance & Accountability (OSPA) and review the SAF list process and functionality of those groups at the schools with Veda Hudge, Director, Service Quality, and the Assistant Directors.

Referring to page 3 of 5, Mrs. Brinkworth said there was a lot of information about an Alternate and if an Alternate misses a meeting. She asked how that would be communicated to the people who are representatives that were selected by the SAF Committee.

Mrs. Brown responded if they did not show up to the meetings, a letter would be sent immediately to say they are no longer part of the Committee.

Mrs. Brinkworth asked if the IZone would be notified that they were not being represented and would there be any type of reminder prior to the letter.

Mrs. Brown answered the IZone would be notified. They would also continue their communication cycle to ensure the SAF Chair sends out email information to everyone so every person would know who was not showing up or not being represented, prior to a letter being sent that states they would not be represented.

The Chair received input from the audience on this item.

Mrs. Levinson followed up to say that everyone in the school was a member of SAF. They have meetings and talk about issues in the school. Everyone is always invited. SAF is the most inclusionary group because everyone is a member. The challenge is ensuring each school has a SAF and is having those types of meetings in their school.

A vote was taken on the item.

Ms. Korn had to leave and passed the gavel to Mrs. Good for the remainder of the meeting.

B. BOARD MEMBERS

E. OFFICE OF STRATEGY & OPERATIONS

***E-1. Pre-Qualification of Contractors - Superintendent's Recommendations Regarding Pre-Qualification Certification (Approved)**

Approved the recommendation by the Superintendent indicated in the Superintendent Recommendations - Tracking Report.

The Pre-Qualification Application process is in accordance with State Requirements for Educational Facilities, F.S. 1013.46, and Board Policies 7003 and 7003.1. This item approves recommendations by the Superintendent of Schools as set forth in the Superintendent Recommendations - Tracking Report. Further explanation is provided in both the Executive Summary and Supplemental Information. The Qualification Selection Evaluation Committee (QSEC) convened on June 3, 2015, to review staff's recommendations concerning pre-qualification applications, and again on June 15, 2015, to review a request for reconsideration from T&G Constructors. QSEC has reviewed staff's recommendations regarding pre-qualification applications, considered T&G Constructors' request for reconsideration, and has forwarded its recommendations to the Superintendent as set forth in the "Superintendent Recommendations - Tracking Report." Contractor Pre-Qualification Staff Application Review Executive Summaries are available online at:

<http://www.broward.k12.fl.us/supply/docs/contracts/PreQual-060315&061515.pdf>

There is no financial impact to the District.

E-2. RFP Renewal - 13-027-1V- Student Psychiatric Services (Approved)

Motion was made by Mrs. Rupert, seconded by Mrs. Brinkworth and carried, to approve the first renewal for the above Request for Proposal (RFP) - 13-027-1V. Contract Term: July 1, 2015, through June 30, 2016, 1 Year; User Department: Exceptional Student Education; Award Amount: \$1,250,000; Vendor Awarded: Nyrma Ortiz, PA; M/WBE Vendors: None. Ms. Korn and Dr. Osgood were absent for the vote. (7-0 vote)

The School Board of Broward County, Florida, received four (4) proposals for RFP 13-027N and RFP 13-027-1V -Student Psychiatric Services. The term of this contract was from July 1, 2013 through, June 30, 2015, with two one-year renewals. This request is to approve the first renewal of this RFP. This RFP provides student psychiatric services to students that are emotional/behavioral disabled as part of a therapeutic program identified in their Individual Educational Plan.

A copy of the RFP documents are available online at:
<http://www.broward.k12.fl.us/supply/agenda/13-027-1V-Student-Psychiatric-Servic.pdf>

This renewal Agreement has been reviewed and approved as to form and legal content by the Office of the General Counsel.

There is no additional financial impact to the District. Funding for this contract comes from the IDEA grant. The financial impact represents an estimated contract value; however, the amount authorized will not exceed the estimated bid award amount.

Mrs. Good wanted to comment on page 1 of 2 that it stated there was now one psychiatrist servicing two Centers and felt moving forward it would be helpful to get feedback from the Centers that the services they are receiving are meeting their needs and expectations. Mrs. Good was concerned if this person was out, who would perform her services. She asked if there would be a possibility to have a backup in the future as an alternate.

Sonja Clay, Director, Exceptional Student Education (ESE), stated they would look into it.

Mrs. Rupert asked staff to follow-up with an email what the current case load was, the anticipated case load, and guaranteed number of hours the doctor would be working with students.

A vote was taken on the item.

***E-3. RFP Recommendation of \$500,000 or Less - 16-004V - Third-Party Administrator for Tax-Sheltered Annuities for School Board Employees (Approved)**

Approved the recommendation for award for the above contract. Contract Term: July 1, 2015, through December 31, 2018; 3 Years, 6 Months; User Department: Benefits and Employment Services; Award Amount: None; Vendor Awarded: TSA Consulting Group, Inc.; M/WBE Vendors: None.

The School Board of Broward County, Florida (SBBC) received one (1) proposal from TSA Consulting Group, Inc. for RFP 16-004V - Third-Party Administrator for Tax-Sheltered Annuities for School Board Employees. The administrator will provide recordkeeping and administration of these annuity services and will remit employees' salary reduction contributions to all SBBC inactive and active vendors.

A copy of the RFP documents are available online at:
<http://www.broward.k12.fl.us/supply/docs/contracts/16-004V-Third-Party-Admin-for-Tax-Sheltered-Annuities.pdf>

This Agreement has been reviewed and approved as to form and legal content by the Office of the General Counsel.

There is no financial impact to the District. Administrative fees are paid by the contracted TSA vendors from RFP 15-010P, 403(b)/457(b) Program for School Board Employees, directly to TSA Consulting Group, Inc.

E-4. First Amendment to Agreement - 15-041V - Speech-Language Pathology and Audiology Services (Approved)

Motion was made by Mrs. Rupert, seconded by Mrs. Rich Levinson and carried, to approve the First Amendment to Agreement for the above contract. Contract Term: November 13, 2014, through June 30, 2017, 2 Years, 7 Months; User Department: Exceptional Student Education; Award Amount: N/A; Awarded Vendor(s): Community Rehab Associates, Inc.; M/WBE Vendor(s): A Graphic Difference, Inc., and Gator Office Products, Inc. Ms. Korn and Dr. Osgood were absent for the vote. (7-0 vote)

This RFP provides speech-language pathologists and audiologists for students who have a communication disorder in the areas of language, articulation, fluency, voice, and deaf/hard of hearing. This request is to change the M/WBE vendor as originally stated in the agreement approved on November 12, 2014, Regular School Board Meeting as EE-5.

See Supporting Docs for continuation of Summary Explanation and Background.

A copy of the RFP documents are available online at:
<http://www.broward.k12.fl.us/supply/agenda/15-041V-Speech-Language-Path-Audiology-Servic.pdf>

This First Amendment to Agreement has been reviewed and approved as to form and legal content by the Office of the General Counsel.

There is no additional financial impact to the District.

Mrs. Good recalled this contract was for a significant amount. She was glad staff was replacing some of the individuals that were part of the contract, which was with Community Rehab Associates, Inc., but it was in conjunction with a chocolate factory and did not understand why. When these contracts come before the Board that state other entities would be provided to fulfill some type of minority participation, Mrs. Good asked staff what kind of follow-up and checking is being conducted with the other entities that are included in the agreement. She wanted to know if the District was approving the additional vendors.

Ruby Crenshaw, Director, Procurement & Warehousing Services, stated they do check the vendors before they are awarded and they send out report utilization reports for vendors to show what they are paying their sub-contractors and that they are indeed using them.

Mrs. Good was baffled at what the chocolate factory could possibly bring to an agreement that deals with speech pathology.

Mrs. Crenshaw replied they provided gift baskets to their employees as recognitions for their incentive program for internal staff.

Mrs. Good stated an allocation of \$4,500 on a contract for \$9 million was embarrassing.

Mrs. Bartleman commented on the minority participation as to how realistic was that to happen if they were using the chocolate as some sort of primary reinforcement for therapy sessions. This is basically contracting individuals to give speech therapy so where does the minority component come into play.

Mr. Runcie asked what the marketplace looked like for individuals who could deliver this service either through companies or as professionals. He believed Mrs. Bartleman was alluding that individuals were contracted to do this service.

Mrs. Clay responded that this was a critical shortage area in which they had to do a lot of recruiting to fill positions and that was the reason they have had to contract out for these particular services.

Mrs. Bartleman said she was happy they had the minority business component but did not know where it fit. Her first thought of the chocolate was reinforcement for the students. She did not understand how it worked together. The most important thing would be to have high quality speech pathologists.

Mr. Runcie questioned how many of the individuals providing this service were minorities. He asked if that was tracked for those assigned/staffed from the company that was contracted.

Mrs. Crenshaw replied she did not have that information with her; however, the company was an M/WBE vendor. They also have had M/WBE participation with the three vendors listed.

A vote was taken on the item.

***E-5. Recommendation to Reject all Proposals -15-116C - Building Code Supplemental Services (Approved)**

Approved the recommendation to reject two (2) proposals received for the above contract.

The School Board of Broward County, Florida, received two (2) proposals for 15-116C, Building Code Supplemental Services, from CAP Government, Inc., and NV5, Inc.

The recommendation to reject all proposals is based on both proposals being deemed non-responsive (see Recommendation Tabulation for detailed information pertaining to bidders responses). This Bid will be advertised at a later date.

There is no financial impact to the District.

E-6. Recommendation to Reject all Proposals - 15-081C (Rebid) - City of Parkland - Classroom Additions (Approved)

Motion was made by Mrs. Rupert, seconded by Mrs. Brinkworth and carried, to approve the recommendation to reject three (3) proposals received for the above contract. Ms. Korn and Dr. Osgood were absent for the vote. (7-0 vote)

The School Board of Broward County, Florida, received three (3) proposals for 15-081C (Rebid) - City of Parkland - Classroom Additions from JWR Construction Services, Inc.; Richard Flanders Enterprises; and FHP Tectonics Corp. The recommendation to reject all proposals is based on all proposals being deemed non-responsive. The re-bid for the City of Parkland - Classroom Additions project is currently being advertised, with a June 24, 2015 due date.

There is no financial impact to the District.

Mrs. Brinkworth inquired why the recommendation was to reject all three bids.

Mrs. Crenshaw replied the vendors that submitted bids were all non-responsive.

Mrs. Brinkworth stated that was not indicated on the Recommendation/Tabulation sheet.

Mrs. Crenshaw said there was an extra page included but it stated they were non-responsive.

Mr. Messier added there was a single responsive proposal in which there was a Cone of Silence violation and deemed them non-responsive.

A vote was taken on the item.

F. OFFICE OF ACADEMICS

***F-1. Agreement between Broward County Environmental Protection and Growth Management Department and The School Board of Broward County, Florida (Approved)**

Approved the Agreement between Broward County Environmental Protection and Growth Management Department and The School Board of Broward County, Florida (SBBC).

This Agreement will provide for Broward County Environmental Protection and Growth Management Department (EPGMD) and The School Board of Broward County (SBBC) to continue work together on projects that are beneficial to the environment and support science instruction through hands-on environmental projects, including classroom presentations and competitions. This is the renewal of an Agreement that originated in 2001 to provide the environmental stewardship resources of EPGMD to the schools.

This agreement has been reviewed and approved as to form and legal content by the Office of the General Counsel.

There is no additional financial impact to the District.

F-2. Continuation of the Agreement with South Broward Hospital District/Memorial Healthcare System for Educational Services to Hospitalized Students, Grades K - 12 (Approved)

Motion was made by Mrs. Rupert, seconded by Mrs. Rich Levinson and carried, to approve the Continuation of the Agreement for the provision of educational services to students who are patients hospitalized for short, intermittent or long term care by the following provider: South Broward Hospital District/Memorial Healthcare System. The term of this agreement shall commence on July 1, 2015 and conclude on June 30, 2016. Ms. Korn and Dr. Osgood were absent for the vote. (7-0 vote)

South Broward Hospital District/Memorial Healthcare System serves Broward County Public School students who have chronic medical conditions that require specialized treatments intermittently throughout the school year or for extended periods of time. Some students need to be hospitalized for the full school day even though the medical treatment may require a much shorter period of time to administer. This Agreement allows for instructional flexibility by assigning an onsite teacher to provide educational services. The instructional and the medical staff coordinate schedules, benefiting the "whole child." Educational software and district approved curriculum materials are utilized to provide academic coursework. The hospital provides the hardware and Internet connections as well as a fully equipped instructional classroom.

The Agreement has been reviewed and approved as to form and legal content by the Office of the General Counsel.

There is no financial impact to the District. The program will be supported by funds generated by Exceptional Student Education FTE. In the event of insufficient FTE funding generated, per the agreement, the hospital will reimburse the School Board of Broward County, Florida any shortfall costs by June 15, 2016.

Mrs. Bartleman requested Mr. Kingsley and Mrs. Clay to follow up on the processes of coordinating services for hospital-bound students.

A vote was taken on the item.

F-3. Head Start/Early Head Start Program Service Plan and School Readiness Goals Report (Approved)

Motion was made by Mrs. Rupert, seconded by Ms. Murray and carried, to approve the 2015-2016 Head Start/ Early Head Start Program Service Plan & 2014-2015 HS-EHS School Readiness Goals End-of-Year Report. Dr. Osgood was absent. (8-0 vote)

The School Board of Broward County, Florida is the selected Head Start grantee and the program's governing body. As such, it is required to make decisions about the program's administration and operations. The responsibilities include the approval of reports, policies, and practices to ensure compliance with the Head Start Program Performance Standards. As per the Head Start Act of 2007, the governing body is required to review and approve the program's Service Plan and annual School Readiness Goals Report.

There is no financial impact to the District.

Ms. Murray said her remarks were directed to Nicole Mancini, Director, Head Start/ VPK and her staff. She continued to say Head Start and Early Childhood Development have been a strong campaign throughout the county and the results show. She met with staff to see which direction the District was heading and said they were so enthusiastic in the report they made of their accomplishments to make the preparations for the children as they come into the school system. The data they accumulated will be provided to Nathan Balasubramanian, Director, Office of Strategy & Continuous Improvement, so the District will be able to start tracking these children and what has been done with the outside agencies.

Ms. Murray said staff was deserving of some stars for their efforts. The solution and effort are at the base and the Head Start/ Early Childhood is the initial part where it starts. She also wanted to thank Wanda Robinson, Community Outreach, for the crock-pot dinners to bring the community together. Ms. Murray commended staff again for their efforts and the results and successes from their departments.

A vote was taken on the item.

***F-4. Business Associate Agreement between The School Board of Broward County, Florida and The City of Coral Springs (Approved)**

Approved the Business Associate Agreement between The School Board of Broward County, Florida and The City of Coral Springs.

The Districts Health Science Education programs provide secondary and postsecondary career technical students with clinical training experiences through contractual agreements with hospitals, nursing homes, and other facilities. Students participating in these programs will handle confidential medical information and PHI under HIPAA and HITECH.

See Supporting Docs for continuation of Summary Explanation and Background.

This agreement has been reviewed and approved as to form and legal content by the Office of the General Counsel. The agreement with the City of Coral Springs will be executed after School Board approval.

There is no financial impact to the District.

G. OFFICE OF HUMAN RESOURCES

G-1. Personnel Recommendations for Instructional Reappointments Instructional Appointments and Leaves for 2015-2016 School Year. (Approved)

Motion was made by Mrs. Rupert, seconded by Mrs. Brinkworth and carried, to approve the personnel recommendations for the 2015-2016 reappointments as listed in the attached Executive Summary and respective lists for instructional employees and authorize, pursuant to section 1011.60(3)(f), Florida Statutes to serve more than (10) calendar months of service. All recommendations are made pending security clearance and with the understanding that these individuals will comply with regulations/ policies as set forth by the Florida Department of Education and The School Board of Broward County, Florida. This motion was superseded by Motions to Separate (page 14). Mrs. Rich Levinson and Dr. Osgood were absent for the vote. (7-0 vote)

The Personnel Recommendations for Instructional Employees include the following items:

1. Instructional Reappointments 2015-2016
2. Teacher Approvals
3. Instructional Leaves

There will be no financial impact to the District. Funding for the positions has been allocated in the school and department budgets.

Ms. Korn stated this item needed to have several people separated due to their relationship with the Board.

Ms. Murray remarked she would be abstaining from this vote because her daughter was being reappointed as a teacher. She asked that her daughter's name, Marie Martin, be separated from this item. Mrs. Murray also stated she had the proper paperwork completed for the General Counsel.

Motion to Separate (Carried)

Motion was made by Ms. Murray, seconded by Mrs. Good and carried, to separate Marie Martin from Item G-1. Mrs. Rich Levinson and Dr. Osgood were absent for the vote. (7-0 vote)

Mrs. Brinkworth asked that her sister-in-law' name, Barbara Pomper, be separated from this item. Mrs. Brinkworth stated she would be abstaining from the vote and would complete the proper paperwork for the General Counsel.

Motion to Separate (Carried)

Motion was made by Mrs. Brinkworth, seconded by Mrs. Rupert and carried, to separate Barbara Pomper from Item G-1. Mrs. Rich Levinson and Dr. Osgood were absent for the vote. (7-0 vote)

Ms. Korn passed the gavel to Mrs. Good in order for her to make the following motion. Ms. Korn also requested that her sister's name, Tara Terribile, be separated from this item. She would be abstaining from the vote and had the completed paperwork to turn in appropriately.

Motion to Separate (Carried)

Motion was made by Ms. Korn, seconded by Mrs. Rupert and carried, to separate Tara Terribile from Item G-1. Mrs. Rich Levinson and Dr. Osgood were absent for the vote. (7-0 vote)

Mrs. Good passed the gavel back to the Chair.

Mrs. Good wanted confirmation that an individual on the list who was a Pre-k teacher and removed from the classroom and reassigned, would no longer be in the classroom until the investigation was completed.

Mr. Runcie replied she was correct. Individuals in that situation are removed from the classroom until the disposition of the case has been completed. Once that happens, appropriate action is taken based on the outcome. The particular individual in question will not be returning to the classroom or be with students until determined by the outcome of that case.

Mrs. Good asked General Counsel if it was standard that the employee must be included on the list of reappointments until such time the investigation has been completed.

Mr. Carland stated that was correct. The employee was employed pursuant to a professional services contract and under Chapter 1012, Section 1012.33, it is clear that a professional services contract must be renewed year-to-year, unless for the reasons set forth in the statutes or if the Superintendent had taken action to terminate the employee for just cause. Since that has not happened at this point, the employee's contract must be renewed and would be subject to whatever action the Superintendent brings forward.

A vote was taken on the remaining G-1 item.

Motion to Approve (Carried)

Motion was made by Mrs. Brinkworth, seconded by Mrs. Good and carried, to approve the reappointment recommendation for Marie Martin. Dr. Osgood was absent. Ms. Murray abstained from the vote. (7-0 vote)

Motion to Approve (Carried)

Motion was made by Mrs. Rupert, seconded by Mrs. Murray and carried, to approve the reappointment recommendation for Barbara Pomper. Dr. Osgood was absent. Mrs. Brinkworth abstained from the vote. (7-0 vote)

Motion to Approve (Carried)

Motion was made by Mrs. Rupert, seconded by Mrs. Murray and carried, to approve the reappointment recommendation for Tara Terribile. Dr. Osgood was absent. Ms. Korn abstained from the vote. (7-0 vote)

***G-2. Personnel Recommendations for Instructional Separation of Employment or Discipline for the 2014-2015 School Year**
(Approved as Amended)

Approved the personnel recommendations for separation of employment or discipline as listed in the attached respective lists for instructional staff. All recommendations are made with the understanding that these individuals will comply with regulations/policies as set forth by the Florida Department of Education and The School Board of Broward County, Florida.

The Personnel Recommendations for Instructional Employees include the following items:

1. Instructional Resignations and Retirements and Layoffs
2. Instructional Suspensions and Terminations and Released During Probationary Period

There will be no financial impact to the District.

**G-3. Personnel Recommendations for Non-Instructional Appointments, Reappointments and Leaves for the 2014-2015 & 2015-2016 School Years
(Approved as Amended)**

Motion was made by Mrs. Rupert, seconded by Mrs. Brinkworth and carried, to approve the 2014-2015 & 2015-2016 personnel recommendations for appointments & reassignments & approve the 2015-2016 reappointments as listed on the attached Executive Summary, lists & individual appointments for Non-Instructional Employees & authorize, pursuant to section 1011.60(3)(f), Florida Statutes, principals, other school site administrators, & instructional staff to serve more than ten (10) calendar months of service. All recommendations are made pending security clearance & with the understanding that these individuals will comply with regulations/policies as set forth by the Florida DOE & SBBC. Dr. Osgood was absent. (8-0 vote)

The Personnel Recommendations for Non-Instructional Employees include the following sections:

1. Non-Instructional (Non-Managerial) Approval(s)/Reassignment(s)/Promotion(s)/Demotion(s)
2. Non-Instructional (Non-Managerial) Substitutes/Temporary Employees
3. Non-Instructional (Non-Managerial) Leave(s)-Layoff(s)
4. Managerial/Professional/Technical (ESMAB, PBA, TSP) Recommended Appointments
5. Reassignment of Current School-Based and District Managerial Appointments
6. School-Based Managerial Personnel Recommended Appointments

See Supporting Docs for continuation of Summary Explanation and Background.

Funding has been budgeted in 2014-2015 fiscal year for all appointments through June 30, 2015. Funding must be budgeted in 2015-2016 fiscal year for reappointments and new hires through June 30, 2016.

Mrs. Good referred to page iii, 8. School-based and District Managerial Personnel Leave(s) for 2015-2016 School/ Fiscal Year pertaining only to those who asked for a leave to work at a charter school, and asked staff for follow-up if there was a limit on the numbers of years requested. She understood other district imposed limitations and would like to receive follow-up from staff and the legal department, if necessary.

Mr. Runcie responded that they anticipated that question and referred to staff for a response.

Susan Rockelman, Director, Talent Acquisition & Operations, replied that an employee would be allowed to take a charter school leave indefinitely as long as they continue to be employed by the charter school. The Leaves department verifies every year those on leave are employed by the charter school so their leave may continue.

Mrs. Good stated because other school districts do not allow that, she thought it should be a conversation for the Board to have on how it may impact the person upon their return with the District's other employees. She would like to know what other districts are doing in the event this District chooses to do the same and asked the Superintendent to follow-up.

Mr. Runcie said he would have staff research what other school districts do throughout the state and bring the information back to the Board through a workshop.

Ms. Korn acknowledge a consensus from the Board by the nodding of their heads agreeing they would like to have as workshop as well to discuss this matter.

Following a vote on the item, Board Members recognized and congratulated newly-appointed District personnel.

***G-4. Personnel Recommendations for Non-Instructional Separation of Employment and Discipline for the 2014-2015 and 2015-2016 School Years
(Approved as Amended)**

Approved the personnel recommendations for separation of employment and discipline as listed on the attached respective lists for Non-Instructional staff. All recommendations are made with the understanding that these individuals will comply with regulations/ policies as set forth by the Florida Department of Education and The School Board of Broward County, Florida.

The Personnel Recommendations include the following items:

Non-Instructional (Non-Managerial) Resignation(s)/ Retirement(s)
Non-Instructional (Non-Managerial) Suspension(s)/ Termination(s)
Managerial and Professional/ Technical Resignation(s)/ Retirement(s)
Managerial and Professional/ Technical Suspension(s)/ Termination(s)
Non-Instructional Discipline

Employees contesting the recommended discipline may avail themselves of due process rights pursuant to their respective Collective Bargaining Agreements or School Board Policy 4015.

There is no financial impact to the District.

***G-5. Supplemental Pay Positions**

(Approved)

Approved the recommended supplemental pay positions of employees for the 2015/2016 school/ fiscal year.

Employees are recommended for supplemental pay positions by Principal or Department Supervisor. Supplemental positions are listed alphabetically by last name, with location and supplement type.

The Supplemental Pay Positions include the following type of supplements: department chairpersons, team leaders, grade level chairpersons, athletic supplements, general and other supplements for the 2015-2016 school year.

Individual listed meet the requirements for the supplemental positions.

Funding has been budgeted in the 2015-2016 school/ fiscal year for all supplements through June 30, 2016.

H. OFFICE OF THE GENERAL COUNSEL

I. OFFICE OF THE SUPERINTENDENT

I-1. The School Board of Broward County, Florida 2014-2015 Annual Educational Equity Act Plan

(Received)

Motion was made by Mrs. Rupert, seconded by Mrs. Brinkworth and carried, to receive the 2014-2015 Annual Educational Equity Act Plan. The Florida Educational Equity Act (FEEA), Section 228.2001, F.S., became law in June 1984, and the rules for implementation were adopted by the State Board of Education in February 1985. The FEEA was amended in 1993 to mandate stronger monitoring and enforcement for gender equity in athletics. Rules for athletics were adopted in September 1994.

The FEEA covers all educational programs and activities operated by public educational institutions. The FEEA implementing rules are consistent with federal laws prohibiting discrimination in employment and programs. The Department of Education has mandated continued focus on African American and Hispanic students' access to high quality instruction, including Advanced Placement courses (AP, IB, AICE), Dual Enrollment (DE), and Level III courses (including AP, IB, AICE, DE, and Honors) 9th - 12th grade. In addition, the FEEA continues to request data on Single-Sex Schools/Classes and Treatment of Pregnant and Parenting Students. Ms. Korn and Dr. Osgood were absent for the vote. (7-0 vote)

See Supporting Docs for continuation of Summary Explanation and Background.

There is no financial impact to the District.

Mrs. Rupert referred to page 27 and asked staff to check the percentage numbers for the District's young black people because she believed the increase was underestimated.

Wladimir Alvarez, Director, EEO/ADA Compliance, replied he would check the numbers with the Student and Research Department and would follow-up with the Board.

Mrs. Rupert said that was fine and she had one more question on the sports compliance. Some of the schools did a great job of having a very detailed plan. She acknowledged Boyd Anderson High, who utilized open houses, feeder schools to name a few. Other schools were repeating the same plan as last year, which did not work.

A vote was taken on the item.

***I-2. Administrative Complaint (EC)
• AMENDMENT**

(Approved as Amended)

~~Receive~~ Approved the Administrative Complaint submitted by the Superintendent and ~~terminate suspend~~ the teacher, (EC) immediately ~~without pay and terminate.~~

Please see the attached supported documents for the Summary Explanation Background.

There is no financial impact to the District.

***I-3. Broward County School Board vs. Nicole Pollino**

(Adopted)

Adopted the Recommended Order, rendered on April 30, 2015, by Mary Li Creasy, Administrative Law Judge, in the matter of Broward County School Board vs. Nicole Pollino, Case No. 14-4303TTS, before the State of Florida Division of Administrative Hearings and enter the proposed final order.

See Supporting Docs for continuation of Summary Explanation and Background.

There is no financial impact to the District.

***I-4. Administrative Complaint - PS**

(Received)

Received the Administrative Complaint submitted by The Superintendent to immediately suspend without pay Paula Sinclair pending the termination of Ms. Sinclair's Professional Service Contract.

Ms. Paula Sinclair, a Professional Service Contract teacher, is being recommended for suspension without pay pending termination of employment in accordance with Florida Statutes 1001.51, 1012.27(5), 1012.33 and 1012.34. Performance concerns began in 2009 as a guidance counselor at Indian Ridge Middle School. In addition to several informal conversations and summary memos capturing performance concerns, Ms. Sinclair received two memos (dated December 8, 2009 and January 13, 2010) stating that she would be placed on a Performance Development Plan if she did not remediate her deficiencies. Ms. Sinclair took a Family Medical Leave from January 19, 2010 through April 23, 2010. She obtained a transfer to Northeast High, effective July 1, 2010 and the performance concerns began there as well. Two notices were prepared advising her that a Performance Development Plan would be written on April 30, 2012. Ms. Sinclair took an unpaid leave from April 20, 2012 through June 8, 2012.

See Supporting Docs for continuation of Summary Explanation and Background.

There is no financial impact to the District.

J. OFFICE OF FACILITIES & CONSTRUCTION

K. OFFICE OF FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT

***K-1. General Fund Amendment as of April 30, 2015**

(Approved)

Approved the attached General Fund Amendment as of April 30, 2015.

General Fund Amendment is submitted to the School Board pursuant to State Board Administrative Rule 6A-1.006. This Amendment is for the purpose of updating the Broward County School District Budget for estimated revenues and appropriation changes in the General Fund. Amendment includes information for the month of April 2015.

There is no additional financial impact to the District.

***K-2. Special Revenue (Grants) Amendment as of April 30, 2015 (Approved)**

Approved the attached Special Revenue (Grants) Amendment as of April 30, 2015.

Special Revenue (Grants) Amendment is submitted to the School Board pursuant to State Board Administrative Rule 6A-1.006. This Amendment is for the purpose of updating the Broward County School District Budget for estimated revenues and appropriation changes in the Special Revenue (Grants). Amendment includes information for the month of April 2015.

There is no additional financial impact to the District.

***K-3. Interim Financial Statements for the Period Ended April 30, 2015
(Approved)**

Approved the Interim Financial Statements for the Period Ended April 30, 2015.

Financial Statements are submitted to the School Board pursuant to the State Board Administrative Rule 6A-1.008. As of April 2015, the fund balance as a percentage of projected revenues was 4.15% and fund balance, excluding Charter Schools revenues, was 4.82%.

There is no additional financial impact to the District.

L. OFFICE OF PORTFOLIO SERVICES

***L-1. Charter School Renewal Agreement - Paragon Academy of Technology, Inc. (Approved)**

Approved the Charter School Renewal Agreement for Paragon Academy of Technology, Inc., on behalf of Paragon Academy of Technology - 5381.

The terms and conditions for the operation of a charter school are set forth by the governing board of the charter school and The School Board of Broward County, Florida, in a written contractual agreement that constitutes a school's charter.

Pursuant to Section 1002.33(8)(b), Florida Statutes, a school's Charter School Agreement may be renewed subject to a program review and provided that none of the statutory grounds for non-renewal have been documented. A copy of all supporting documents is available at the Charter Schools Management/Support Department on the 12th floor of the K.C.W. Administration Center.

A copy of all supporting documents is available online via the Broward County Public Schools eAgenda at:
<https://webappe.browardschools.com/eagenda/>

See Supporting Docs for continuation of Summary Explanation and Background.

This Agreement has been reviewed and approved as to form and legal content by the Office of the General Counsel.

There is no financial impact to the District.

***L-2. First Amendment to Charter School Agreement with Somerset Academy, Inc. on behalf of Somerset Academy Hollywood Middle School - 5419 (POSTPONED 06/9/15 RSBM) (Not Approved)**

Approve the First Amendment to the Charter School Agreement with Somerset Academy, Inc. on behalf of Somerset Academy Hollywood Middle School - 5419.

Somerset Academy, Inc., a Florida non-profit corporation, on behalf of Somerset Academy Hollywood Middle - 5419, desires to amend its charter school agreement to change the location of the charter school for the 2015-2016 school year and subsequent years. A copy of all supporting documents is available at the Charter Schools Management/Support Department on the 12th floor of the K.C.W. Administration Center. A copy of all supporting documents is available online via the Broward County Public Schools eAgenda at:
<https://webappe.browardschools.com/eagenda>

See Supporting Docs for continuation of Summary Explanation and Background.

This Amendment has been reviewed and approved as to form and legal content by the Office of the General Counsel.

There is no financial impact to the District.

***L-3. Second Amendment to Charter School Agreement with Somerset Academy, Inc. on behalf of Somerset Preparatory Charter Middle School - 5441 (POSTPONED 06/9/15 RSBM) (Not Approved)**

Approve the Second Amendment to the Charter School Agreement with Somerset Academy, Inc. on behalf of Somerset Preparatory Charter Middle School - 5441.

Somerset Academy, Inc., a Florida non-profit corporation, on behalf of Somerset Preparatory Charter Middle - 5441, desires to amend its charter school agreement to co-locate its charter school location with Somerset Academy Hollywood Middle Charter School - 5419 for the 2015-2016 school year and subsequent years. A copy of all supporting documents is available at the Charter Schools Management/Support Department on the 12th floor of the K.C.W. Administration Center.

A copy of all supporting documents is available online via the Broward County Public Schools eAgenda at:
<https://webappe.browardschools.com/eagenda/>

See Supporting Docs for continuation of Summary Explanation and Background.

This Amendment has been reviewed and approved as to form and legal content by the Office of the General Counsel.

There is no financial impact to the District.

***L-4. First Amendment to Charter School Agreement with Somerset Academy, Inc. on behalf of Somerset Academy Hollywood - 5387 (POSTPONED 06/9/15 RSBM) (Not Approved)**

Approve the First Amendment to the Charter School Agreement with Somerset Academy, Inc. on behalf of Somerset Academy Hollywood - 5387.

Somerset Academy, Inc., a Florida non-profit corporation, on behalf of Somerset Academy Hollywood - 5387, desires to amend its charter school agreement to change the location of the charter school for the 2015-2016 school year and subsequent years. A copy of all supporting documents is available at the Charter Schools Management/Support Department on the 12th floor of the K.C.W. Administration Center.

A copy of all supporting documents is available online via the Broward County Public Schools eAgenda at:
<https://webappe.browardschools.com/eagenda>

See Supporting Docs for continuation of Summary Explanation and Background.

This Amendment has been reviewed and approved as to form and legal content by the Office of the General Counsel.

There is no financial impact to the District.

***L-5. Second Amendment to Charter School Agreement with Somerset Academy, Inc. on behalf of Somerset East Preparatory Academy - 5391 (POSTPONED 06/9/15 RSBM) (Not Approved)**

Approved the Second Amendment to the Charter School Agreement with Somerset Academy, Inc. on behalf of Somerset East Preparatory Academy - 5391.

Somerset Academy, Inc., a Florida non-profit corporation, on behalf of Somerset East Preparatory Academy - 5391, desires to amend its charter school agreement to co-locate its charter school location with Somerset Academy Hollywood Charter School - 5387 for the 2015-2016 school year and subsequent years. A copy of all supporting documents is available at the Charter Schools Management/Support Department on the 12th floor of the K.C.W. Administration Center.

A copy of all supporting documents is available online via the Broward County Public Schools eAgenda at:
<https://webappe.browardschools.com/eagenda/>

See Supporting Docs for continuation of Summary Explanation and Background.

This Amendment has been approved as to form and legal content by the Office of the General Counsel.

There is no financial impact to the District.

OPEN ITEMS

AA. RESOLUTIONS

BB. BOARD MEMBERS

BB-1. Membership in the Council of the Great City Schools for the 2015-2016 School Year (Approved)

Motion was made by Mrs. Rupert, seconded by Mrs. Brinkworth and carried, to approve the renewal of the School Board's membership in the Council of the Great City Schools. Dr. Osgood was absent. (8-0 vote)

June 23, 2015

Minutes of Regular Meeting
Page 24 of 102

The Council of the Great City Schools represents over 50 large urban school districts and is recognized as one of the most effective advocacy organizations in Washington, D.C., voicing the concerns of urban public education. The Council of the Great City Schools has been enormously productive this year and remains the best and most aggressive advocate for urban schools in the nation. The Council of the Great City Schools is an organization that belongs solely to urban educators for urban education and urban children - all the time.

The financial impact to the District is \$54,696. The source of these funds is the School Board Members' department budget.

No discussion was held on this item.

CC. BOARD POLICIES

CC-1. Revisions to School Board Policy 1341, Use of Broward County School Facilities for Non-School Purposes (Adopted as Amended)

Motion was made by Mrs. Rupert, seconded by Mrs. Brinkworth and carried, to adopt the revisions to School Board Policy 1341, Use of Broward County School Facilities for Non-School Purposes. This motion was superseded by a Motion to Amend (page 28). Dr. Osgood was absent. (8-0 vote)

School Board Policy 1341 governs the use of Broward County school facilities for non-school purposes by other groups or organizations. The proposed changes to the Policy are generally as follows:

See Supporting Docs for continuation of Summary Explanation and Background.

This revised Policy has been reviewed and approved as to form and legal content by the Office of the General Counsel.

There is no financial impact to the School District; therefore, this item does not require a Collaboration Form from the Capital Budget Department.

Mrs. Brinkworth had questions about changes from the workshop to today's meeting. On page 1 in the second paragraph, there was a change made with language pertaining to raffles during the workshop, in which was taken out and she wanted to know why the change was made.

Mrs. Brown replied they checked with legal about schools being allowed to include raffles in which they clarified for staff.

Mrs. Brinkworth appreciated staff taking feedback regarding School Allied Groups (SAG) and how the extra paperwork would impact their ability to support schools. She had a question on 5.a. In her experience, PTAs would meet with principals, review a calendar for the year of events and at that time the principal would calendar those events for the entire year. In this section, it states the request must first be made in writing to the school's principal or facility director and approved and then they would provide notice. Mrs. Brinkworth wanted to know if the calendar meeting between the PTA and principal suffice for the notice or would they have to give written notice for every event they have throughout the year and then receive written notice back from the principal.

Mrs. Brown replied anytime a SAG would do an event, there should be something documented for the database. If there were a calendar that was set and went from the SAG to the principal where the principal signed off, that would suffice of the notice for the year.

Mrs. Brinkworth inquired where it states the SAG would be notified, what would the notification be for that notification to take place.

Mrs. Brown said if a school advisory group meets with a principal, then the principal would have 48 hours to review the calendar and either approve or advise the SAG that there may be a discrepancy with a date on an annual calendar or individual event. It would be provided in writing on the form and sent back to the SAG. It could also be communicated via email or a phone call, in addition to the returned form.

Mrs. Brinkworth asked for clarification on the calendar review and if they would have to fill out the form in addition to the calendar review for each event for the year.

In the calendar review, Mrs. Brown stated they would do a form for each of the events because each may have different things involved. She gave an example if a PTA was going to do seven (7) events for the year, there would be a calendar and a form for each of the events, then they would meet with the principal to discuss the entire year, the principal would have 48 hours to double check the calendar and sign off on each of the events. The principal would then have documentation for each of the SAG events and a full calendar for the entire year.

Mrs. Brinkworth inquired if they would be entering the information into the event management system.

Mrs. Brown responded they currently only have seven (7) schools in the events management system pilot. Eventually the SAG would enter it and it would be approved within 48 hours electronically. Until all schools are in the system, the principal or assistant principal would enter the information into the database.

Mrs. Brinkworth asked the Superintendent to ensure the PTA has communicated to their group when they have their annual meeting what is they need to do to in order to make sure everyone is following process properly.

Mrs. Brown offered for her team to go to each of the schools' first meeting and provide a PowerPoint of the process. They would also archive that information on their website for anyone to get if they need a refresher.

On page 7, Mrs. Brinkworth said there was some question at the workshop regarding the reduction of the insurance amounts, and she wanted to ensure it had been approved by Risk Management.

Mrs. Brown replied yes.

Mrs. Brinkworth referred to page 7, 12.b. pertaining to the food trucks. She asked what were the requirements this language was referring to for this policy.

Mrs. Brown replied that a memo was sent out with a checklist that was developed by the Health Department and would be included in any request for the use of food trucks.

Mrs. Brinkworth wanted to confirm if all of the strikethroughs on the fee schedule were just to align with the requests made at the workshop with regards to the minimum, in which staff confirmed.

Mrs. Good referred to page 2, number 14-School Function. She first wanted to thank staff for taking all the comments from the Board workshop into consideration. In regards to School Function, she wanted to be clear if that included Relays for Life, which is a school function for the Cancer Society. She asked if the schools would be able to continue having dock washes, car washes, and similar community events.

Mrs. Brown answered they would be included.

Referring to the SAG on page 4, 5.a., Ms. Korn stated that many parents are prepared earlier than the school calendar and there could be some PTAs that submit their events prior to the school putting their school calendar together. As the policy states, the principal would only have 48 hours to respond and if the school calendar was not in place, it would be impossible to determine if the events would fit. She suggested adding language such as "within the school calendar" or something similar. In addition, the timeframe for the principal to respond should be adjusted to a more reasonable timeframe when they would have their school calendar.

Ms. Korn suggested adding language after the second sentence to read, "...within forty-eight (48) hours of receipt of the written request," "but no sooner than a week before school starts." She asked the General Counsel for advice on the appropriate wording for an amendment.

Mr. Carland suggested at the end of the second sentence to add, "...providing the school calendar has been approved." The contingency would be the school calendar and once it was approved, then the principal would have the 48-hour response requirement.

Motion to Amend (Carried)

Motion was made by Mrs. Rupert, seconded by Mrs. Bartleman and carried, to amend School Board Policy 1341, Use of Broward County School Facilities for Non-School Purposes, page 4, 5.a. School Allied Groups, with added language at the end of the second sentence to read: "... within forty-eight (48) hours of receipt of the written request, "provided that the school calendar has been approved." Dr. Osgood was absent. (8-0 vote)

Mrs. Bartleman asked if the principals would still have flexibility to move things in the event of an emergency.

Mrs. Brown agreed there would not be any limitations for the principal or SAG. This was just to ensure the SAG receives a response from the principal. There is nothing in policy that limits activities or events from being added.

A vote was taken on the Motion to Amend.

Mrs. Bartleman indicated she was uncomfortable with the \$500,000 reduction for insurance. She asked why it would be more beneficial to the District to have \$500,000 for insurance instead of the previous \$1 million.

Aston Henry, Director, Risk Management, responded that after a review of losses over the last ten (10) years for leases, there was only one loss at Wilton Manors Elementary School, which did not exceed \$450,000. Based on the data, that was the largest loss the District had over the ten-year period. There has been a lot of resistance from organizations trying to lease the District's facilities with the belief that the \$1 million was too high. Since there had only been one loss, they felt \$500,000 was more than adequate for insurance coverage.

Mrs. Bartleman asked about personal injury or harm.

Mr. Henry said in regards to someone who gets hurt on campus, \$300,000 is required for general liability coverage. That amount was more than adequate due to no major losses over the ten-year period reviewed.

Future losses were also taken into consideration; however, the decision was based on the data staff had over the ten-year period.

Ms. Korn said the bodily injury for each occurrence did not change but each person went up from \$100,000 to \$200,000.

Mr. Henry replied the change was due to statutory limits. If three people were hurt at an event, the maximum the District would be required to pay would be \$300,000 for each occurrence as opposed to one person hurt at an event to be paid at \$200,000.

Mr. Carland added the requirements in the policy are there to cover the District's maximum exposure under the statute. If there was an event that occurred on campus and someone was injured, the District's maximum liability by statute would be \$200,000. The users of the facility are now required to match that amount to indemnify the District for its full exposure. The \$300,000 per occurrence indicates if there was an event where multiple people were injured by the same event, the District's maximum exposure would be \$300,000 and the user of the facility would be covering that exposure by statute. If there were separate events, and multiple people are injured at separate events, then each of those covered would be of \$200,000.

A vote was taken on the item as amended.

CC-2. Proposed Revised Job Description for School Principal (Approved as Amended)

Motion was made by Mrs. Rupert, seconded by Mrs. Brinkworth and carried, to approve the revised job description for School Principal. Approval is requested to advertise the position after the first reading. This is the first reading. This motion was superseded by a Motion to Amend (page 31). Dr. Osgood was absent. (8-0 vote)

Revisions to the job description for the School Principal position are recommended in order to comply with grant funding criteria and update references to prior standards and evaluation methods.

The job description was publicized for rule adoption in compliance with Florida Statutes on Tuesday, June 9, 2015. See attached Executive Summary.

Copies of all supporting documents are available in the Board Members' Office on the 14th floor, K.C. Wright Administration Center, and available online via the Broward County Public Schools eAgenda at: <http://webappe.browardschools.com/eAgenda/>

There is no additional financial impact to the District.

Mrs. Rupert appreciated the effort staff took to condense this item. On page 2, it addresses the principals for the Exceptional Student Education (ESE) Centers. She asked why the master's degree was removed from the requirement on page 3 or if it was placed somewhere else in the description.

Michael Anderson, Director, Compensation & Human Resource Information System (HRIS), said it appeared it was inadvertently removed and not replaced and that would address it before this item comes back for a final reading.

Mrs. Bartleman explained a person with their bachelor's degree in the ESE program going for a master's degree, would have many different routes to lead them into administration, with most preferring to get their master's degree in Educational Leadership, which would limit the master's pool.

Desmond Blackburn, Chief School Performance & Accountability Officer, reiterated they would review the job description, but the job description for Principals-ESE Centers currently requires the principal to be ESE-Certified and have two (2) of their five (5) years of public school experience in the ESE environment. He stated they felt this would suffice, along with the committee that worked on it but would look at it before the second reading.

Mrs. Rupert was unsure as to whether the master's degree was inadvertently left off or if staff felt the language sufficed with the requirements brought to the Board in this item.

Mr. Anderson said he would defer to Dr. Blackburn's comments.

Mrs. Rupert requested that consideration be given to include the master's degree in the job description. On page 4, under Instructional Leadership, number 3, where it states "Achieve results on the school's student learning goals," she said everyone would receive some kind of results. She requested the word "expected" be added to "results" instead of the word "achieve." Number 12 was removed from the list of requirements, which she felt covered the whole collaborative/reading focus. Mrs. Rupert stated she preferred the term stakeholders over customers and asked staff to be consistent with what is used throughout the District. There were many other customer focus requirements that were deleted from the list as well. Mrs. Rupert specifically asked what happened to items 53-69 since she did not see them moved somewhere else.

Dr. Blackburn asked to provide context on Agenda Items CC-1, CC-2, and CC-3. The District received funding from the Wallace Foundation for \$500,000 in year one and tentatively, \$1.7 million for year two. One of the requirements of the work to enhance the leadership pipeline in the District was to take very hard look at three job descriptions: Director, Principal, and Assistant Principal. They not only had to look at the descriptions, but they had to bring in the work being done at the national level on creating standards for the practice of leadership at those three levels. They worked with the Council of Chief State Officers, the University of Washington, and the Wallace Foundation, in addition to following the District's protocol and expectations. Dr. Blackburn stated they would look into some of the questions raised to bring back to the second reading.

Mrs. Rupert reiterated she did not like the fact that all the customer focus was eliminated from the list. If principals are going to be evaluated, those requirements need to be included if that is the District's focus.

Mrs. Bartleman clarified the ESE degree should be a bachelor's or master's. She made reference that she saw School Advisory Forum (SAF) listed, but did not see School Advisory Forum (SAF). She has heard from parents that has not been support or participation in SAF and she felt if it part of the District's policies, it needs support from the principals, directors, and individuals from within the District.

Motion to Amend (Carried)

Motion was made by Mrs. Rupert, seconded by Mrs. Bartleman and carried, to amend language to the School Principal Job Description, page 4, Instructional Leadership: 2. by adding, "and School Advisory Forum (SAF)" after School Advisory Council (SAC); and 3. by deleting "Achieve" and adding "expected" results.... Dr. Osgood was absent. (8-0 vote)

A vote was taken on the Motion to Amend.

The Chair received input from the audience on this motion.

Ms. Korn asked staff if they were going to review and highlight the global perspective comments from her colleague to address the stakeholders and principals' responsibilities.

Mr. Runcie stated staff would review notes from the comments today regarding customer focus, marketing, and stakeholders. One of the three pillars the District will use at it moves forward with the Beyond Expected Student Targets (BEST) Blueprint, is the ability that schools and principals in particular, is to establish and create great internal relationships within the schools, as well as the external community.

Mr. Runcie said they would review the District's expectations with principals and what had been going on in Broward to ensure the requirements and expectations are reflected in the job requirements.

Mrs. Brinkworth with regards to open lines of communication to all stakeholders, she felt that was something that needed to be reflected as to how stakeholders are held with respect to this particular job description. It is incumbent for principals to communicate with their internal and external stakeholders and to have open lines of communication. To avoid any issues, it should be included.

A vote was taken on this item.

**CC-3. Proposed Revised Job Description for Assistant Principal
(Approved as Amended)**

Motion was made by Mrs. Rupert, seconded by Mrs. Good and carried, to approve the revised job description for the Assistant Principal position. Approval is requested to advertise the position after the first reading. This is the first reading. This motion was superseded by a Motion to Amend (below). Dr. Osgood was absent. (8-0 vote)

Revisions to the job description for the Assistant Principal position are provided in order to comply with grant funding requirements and to update references to outdated performance responsibilities.

The job description was publicized for rule adoption in compliance with Florida Statutes on Tuesday, June 9, 2015. See attached Executive Summary.

Copies of all supporting documents are available in the Board Members' Office on the 14th floor of the K.C. Wright Administration Center and are available online via the Broward County Public Schools eAgenda at: <http://webappe.browardschools.com/eAgenda/>

There is no additional financial impact to the District.

Mrs. Rupert stated this item mirrored CC-3 for principals. Also, in the Executive Summary, it states the "The job description acknowledges... while reducing the number of essential performance responsibilities from 106 to 107." The number should have been 37 instead of 107 and needed to be corrected. On page 4, make the same change for principals using the word "expected" results and change customer to stakeholder.

Motion to Amend (Carried)

Motion was made by Mrs. Rupert, seconded by Mrs. Good and carried, to amend language to the School Assistant Principal Job Description, page 4, Instructional Leadership: 3. Assist in... and delete "achieving" and replace with "expected" results..., and replace "customer" with "stakeholder" throughout the job description. Dr. Osgood was absent. (8-0 vote)

A vote was taken on the Motion to Amend.

Mrs. Bartleman commented that the concerns from principals regarding the scores and percentages were not in the job description and wanted to know where those were and who decided the percentages.

Ms. Korn replied it was in the evaluation.

Dr. Blackburn stated the current evaluation structure had been a collaborative effort between the District and the meet and confer organizations. There was a process it would through in order to create it, but that was separate from the job descriptions.

A vote was taken on the item.

CC-4. Proposed Revised Job Description for the Director, School Performance and Accountability (Approved as Amended)

Motion was made by Mrs. Rupert, seconded by Mrs. Good and carried, to approve the revised job description for the Director, School Performance and Accountability. Approval is requested to advertise the position after the first reading. This the first reading. This motion was superseded by Motions to Amend (pages 34). Ms. Murray and Dr. Osgood were absent for the vote. (7-0 vote)

Revisions to the job description for the Director, School Performance and Accountability are recommended in order to emphasize the support, coaching and supervisory role of this position with regard to principals engaged in facilitating student achievement and professional learning.

The job description was publicized for rule adoption in compliance with Florida Statutes on Tuesday, June 9, 2015. See attached Executive Summary.

Copies of all supporting documents are available at the Board Members' Office on the 14th Floor of the K.C. Wright Administration Center and available online via the Broward County Public Schools eAgenda at: <http://webappe.browardschools.com/eAgenda/>

There is no additional financial impact to the District.

Mrs. Rupert asked where the Cadre Directors fit in the job descriptions in relation to the Chief School Performance and Accountability Officer.

Dr. Blackburn responded CC-4 covered them as a Director.

Mrs. Bartleman would like to see language regarding SAF and District Advisory (DAC) structure. They need to be committed to the organizational structure set up with the community. She asked where it was reflected in the job description and if it was not to suggest where to place it.

Dr. Blackburn replied the latter part of number 9 referred to parent organizations, but it could be reviewed and strengthened for the second reading.

Motion to Amend (Carried)

Motion was made by Mrs. Bartleman, seconded by Mrs. Rupert and carried, to amend the Director, School Performance and Accountability Job Description, Essential Performance Responsibilities, 9., to add language at the end of the sentence to read: ... "and School Advisory Forum (SAF) and District Advisory Council (DAC)." Dr. Osgood was absent. Mrs. Freedman voted "no." (7-1 vote)

A vote was taken on the Motion to Amend.

The Chair received input from the audience on this motion.

Ms. Korn asked for clarification if Cadre Directors oversee the budget, meaning, once it goes from the principal, the District budget office oversees it.

Dr. Blackburn stated the Cadre Directors do participate in the budget conference and approval process.

Ms. Korn asked if it was identified in the job description as a responsibility.

Dr. Blackburn replied no, but could add budget language if requested.

Ms. Korn passed the gavel to Mrs. Good in order for her to make the following motion.

Second Motion to Amend (Carried)

Motion was made by Ms. Korn, seconded by Mrs. Rupert and carried, to amend the Director, School Performance and Accountability Job Description, Essential Performance Responsibilities, 10., by adding, ...to facilitate operational procedures "oversee budget" to maximize....

Dr. Osgood was absent. (8-0 vote)

Mrs. Good passed the gavel back to the Chair.

Following a vote on the Second Motion to Amend, a vote was taken on the item as amended.

CC-5. The School Board of Broward County, Florida 2015-2016 Organizational Chart Job Descriptions (Approved as Amended)

Motion was made by Mrs. Rupert, seconded by Mrs. Good and carried, to approve the job descriptions associated with The School Board of Broward County, Florida 2015-2016 Organizational Chart. Approval is requested to advertise these positions after the first reading. This is the first reading. This motion was superseded by Motions to Amend (pages 40, 41 and 46). Mrs. Freedman and Dr. Osgood were absent from the vote. Mrs. Rupert voted "no." (6-1 vote)

Each year, the Superintendent makes recommended changes to the Organizational Chart, intended to better position the District in executing its priorities and achieving the Strategic Plan Goals. This year, 48 new and revised job descriptions are submitted for approval with the 2015-2016 Organizational Chart.

The job descriptions have been publicized for rule adoption in compliance with Florida Statutes on Sunday, June 7, 2015. See attached Executive Summary.

Copies of all supporting documents are available at the Board Members' Office on the 14th floor of the K.C. Wright Administration Center and are available online via the Broward County Public Schools eAgenda at: <http://webappe.browardschools.com/eAgenda/>.

There is no additional financial impact to the District.

Agenda items CC-5 and II-3 were discussed concurrently.

Mrs. Rupert asked if the positions for Manager, Mechanical Engineering; Manager, Architectural Engineering; Manager, Electrical Engineering; and Manager, ADA Accessibility were all under the umbrella of PERC (Public Employees Relations Commission).

Mr. Anderson replied no because they did not qualify.

Mrs. Rupert stated she believed they did previously, specifically the Manager, Mechanical Engineering, which existed in the former Design Services department. The new position does not require a professional engineering license, has less responsibility, and starts at a higher pay grade than the former Design Services position. Mrs. Rupert questioned what caused this position to be removed from under PERC.

Mr. Anderson responded there was a very specific process that the PERC used to determine whether or not a position could be with a collective bargaining unit. These specific positions would be overseeing contractors, and in some cases other employees, and would be performing at a level considered managerial/ administrative. They would have specific duties that would negate them from being covered under a collective bargaining agreement. The job descriptions were also reviewed by Mr. Messier and legal counsel.

Mrs. Rupert said the last time when the conversation up, she asked if these were under PERC and was told if they were eligible they would go to PERC.

Mr. Anderson stated these were newly-created positions to carry specific responsibilities associated with the bond. After reviewing the specific job responsibilities, the District-wide level of performance, and the significant amount of money that would be overseen, it was determined that the positions would be classified as ESMAB (Educational Support & Management Association of Broward, Inc.). The union always has the right to take them to PERC and partition PERC to have them added to the process. If they met the criteria they would automatically default to PERC.

Mr. Carland remarked the process stated by Mr. Anderson was essentially correct in that it is the Board's prerogative by statute to create job positions and establish a criteria and responsibility for those positions. When the Board designates a job description, the Board would also designate, upon the recommendation of the Superintendent, what classification that position would fit in (i.e., administrative, managerial, or a position that would appropriately be in a bargaining unit.). Upon the recommendations of the administration, if the Board establishes a position that is recommended for exclusion of the unit, and would be considered a managerial position, it is perfectly fine if no party objects.

Mr. Carland continued to explain if a party objected and believed that the position should have been classified in their unit, they then would have the option to file a petition with PERC, but PERC ultimately had the final decision to say whether or not it fits within the classification of the unit. If it did fit, the position would be classified as a TSP (Technical Support Professional Unit). It may be after further consideration and review that TSP decides to reclassify the position. If there was no objection and they were designated as managerial, they would stay managerial unless someone decided to go to PERC.

Mrs. Rupert thanked General Counsel but added the union had vocalized this at their last meeting and believed the TSP bargaining unit was being eroded. She was unsure if it was necessary to wait for that aspect to petition or if a Memo of Understanding (MOU) could be used to state the positions would not be filled until they were reviewed by PERC, which would accomplish the same thing.

Mr. Runcie responded this had come up in the past for a number of positions in certain areas. It was not going to change the position, the role, or the scope. Whether the position was in a bargaining unit or not, it would not matter. It is important to move forward to fill the positions to get the work done. It would be best to allow the process with PERC to determine the outcome.

Mrs. Rupert asked if an MOU would hold anything up pertaining to the bond.

Mr. Carland replied if the purpose of the MOU was to determine what the parties were going to do in terms of going to PERC, it could be done but does not require either party to petition PERC to properly classify positions.

Ms. Murray had a statement of clarification that what was on the organization chart now was not anything that had not happened in the past. She was involved with a unit where titles changed, position responsibilities changed, the labor group changed, and the jobs continued. Some challenged it and it went to the state. The day-to-day operations did not change and the ruling from the state did not change either. She said the process is in place and does not interrupt anything. In order for the Superintendent and staff to move forward with this plan certainly would not interfere or prevent a unit from challenging the structure of the organization chart as far as representation. Speaking from her own experience, Ms. Murray knows the process works and that it is available to anyone, based on whoever is representing them. PERC made the final decision when it rolled back and there was very little change other than who fell into what unit. She did not want anyone to think this was something new; it had been a practice in the District for many, many years. There was a course of action available to anyone that may question what has happened and they would know what rights were available to them.

Mrs. Rupert inquired about the position for Manager, Mechanical Engineering, where language was removed in the description stating it did not require a professional engineering license, there would be less responsibility, and the position would start at a higher pay grade. She wanted to know how that was saving the District money.

Mr. Anderson responded, from a compensation perspective they classify the positions appropriately by meeting with business process owners and understanding what their specific needs are to get the job done. Staff works with them to come up with a job description to ensure it is consistent with other job descriptions within the pay plan. He deferred to Mr. Messier to address the pay plan.

Mr. Messier stated the position was not less responsibility. They would not be doing the design work themselves anymore, but would be responsible for the entire functional area for mechanical engineering for the entire District. This is a significant responsibility, with over \$270 million worth of mechanical work scheduled as part of the bond. They would be accountable to the entire functional area. This position would be responsible for the management of that entire area and the budgets that are included. They would also be responsible for challenging and difficult decisions and the decisions made will have budgetary impacts of how to move forward with the program. This was a different position as it was not a practicing mechanical engineer. They are managing a functional area and that was why they did not need the professional engineering license. Mr. Messier said many would probably have one but it was not a requirement.

Mrs. Rupert's next question pertained to the position of Manager, ADA Accessibility. This person has been a direct report for 16-17 years and never needed a manager. She asked staff to explain the additional layer and additional cost to the District.

Mr. Messier replied the Manager of ADA Accessibility would own that functional area so they would be responsible for the transition plan and ensuring it was updated and executed. Currently there is a very talented person who is a Specialist, but the Specialist title is not sufficient to the responsibility level. They were trying to keep the historical knowledge, but they also needed someone who was going to own the transition plan to make sure it would be monitored and implemented.

Mrs. Rupert would like the title for the Manager, Emergency Management & Chief Fire Official changed to the Director, Environmental Occupational Safety, Emergency & Fire Safety. Mrs. Rupert said the position was extremely important to the District and suggested moving it up to a Director reporting to the Chief of Staff, with the Manager of Safety under that person, Manager of Emergency Management, Manager of Fire Casualty Sanitation Inspections & Training under that, as well as Plans Examiner Inspector under Fire.

Mr. Moquin explained the recommendation came from an opportunity to expand the Safety department to include the environmental health component, as well as a training arm. The opportunity he saw, having been through Hurricane Wilma, was that Risk Management handled the loss recoveries of excess insurance and Safety handled Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) recoveries. Both were the same function but were not coordinated. Recognizing they were expanding the Safety department, this was an opportunity to integrate some related functionality that had transitioned over the years from department to department.

Mr. Moquin clarified there were concerns about functionalities they were responsible to perform would go away and said that was not accurate. They would continue with the emergency preparedness program and the joint fire-safety programs would continue by the some people performing them today. There have been over \$148 million allocated to fire and safety through the SMART program. The Bond Oversight Committee has nine members of which one is from that association. The commitment to fire safety remains strong. Prior to 2010-2011, the District did not have a chief fire official designation. It was his recommendation to approve agenda items CC-5 and II-3 so as they transition into the new year, they would have the Chief Fire Official and the individual placed in that position already performing that role. Mr. Moquin was committed to sit with Mr. Messier to determine what the optimal structure would be organizationally to perform these duties, as well as counsel with the Fire Chiefs Association to determine if there was a need due to any oversight, and if so, to come back with an alternative recommendation.

Mrs. Rupert advised staff she would not be supporting agenda items CC-5 and II-3 because of this job description and the PERC situation she previously discussed. Even if this gave the unions an opportunity to come back and voice this, they would lose their bumping ability, which would not be retroactive. She thanked staff and said she appreciated their explanations.

Ms. Korn asked for clarification on whether anyone could apply for these positions, regardless of the bargaining unit, since they were new positions and not a vacancy.

Mrs. Good added if anyone could bump into a new vacancy position.

Eric Chisem, Director, Talent Acquisition & Operations, responded someone could bump into a new position if it were lateral or lower, but they could not bump into a higher position that was new.

Ms. Korn asked the General Counsel to provide clarification at the next reading.

Mrs. Bartleman spoke about the Fire Chiefs and the recommendation from the previous director that the Manager for Emergency Management should fall under the Fire Chiefs. She would also prefer that the Fire Chiefs be placed at the top, aligned with the Chief of Police, and the Building Official and asked the Superintendent to reconsider these positions.

Ms. Murray wants to be assured that the job itself would be performed the way it was, with or without a "director" title over the department. She said staff was obligated to bring that back to the Board and advise who was taking care of what. She said she would support the action of staff.

Mrs. Brinkworth was concerned about adding so many layers to the construction and how the costs of those projects would be impacted by the layers of management. She also stated that she would prefer Mr. Moquin be proactive, rather than the "if need be" approach, to have conversations with the Fire Chiefs Association. Regarding job descriptions, on page 16, Assistant Director, Engagement, the word parental is mentioned throughout the job description and yet it was taken from the job title. She was confused for the reasoning it was removed as there was no other form of engagement. If it was supposed to be for parent and community engagement, there was nothing that addressed community engagement in that job description. Mrs. Brinkworth stated the organizational chart appears the person was directly above the Specialist, Parental Engagement and Specialist, Community Engagement.

Mr. Runcie said that was an important aspect of the job description and he would have staff review why it was removed and add it again if necessary.

Motion to Amend (Carried)

Motion was made by Mrs. Brinkworth, seconded by Mrs. Rupert and carried, to amend Assistant Director, Engagement, Job Description, page 17, by adding language to Supervision: The position supervises "Specialist, Parental Engagement, Specialist, Community Engagement, and" staff as assigned. Dr. Osgood was absent. (8-0 vote)

A vote was taken on the Motion to Amend.

Mrs. Brinkworth referred to the Job Description on page 32, Director, Pre-Construction and asked staff to explain why the licensed contractor was removed and if there would be a problem to add it back.

Mr. Anderson replied it could be added back.

Second Motion to Amend (Carried)

Motion was made by Mrs. Brinkworth, seconded by Mrs. Rupert and carried, to amend the Director, Pre-Construction, Job Description, page 32, by adding back the language struck-through under Required: ... "licensed contractor," or professional engineer in the State of Florida. Dr. Osgood was absent. (8-0 vote)

A vote was taken on the Second Motion to Amend.

Mrs. Brinkworth asked Mr. Messier if he had an opportunity to review all the job descriptions and if he was comfortable with what was brought to the Board.

Mr. Messier responded yes, he had reviewed all the job descriptions.

Mrs. Brinkworth referred to page 169 for the Chief Information Officer and asked staff to check if there were certificates previously included that were no longer in the job description. Her last comment pertained to the Emergency Management and Chief Fire Official and she wanted to ensure it met state statute requirements and addressed the concerns by the Fire Chiefs Association.

Mrs. Good stated she was hopeful there were individuals in current positions that would have the opportunity to move up with increased responsibilities. She was certain staff, along with the Superintendent and General Counsel, would follow the processes in place. Mrs. Good commented on her concerns regarding the Chief Fire Official and Building Official and felt the Board did not have a chance to review for a second time.

Mr. Runcie addressed her concerns by stating he would commit to the Board he would meet with staff and the fire chiefs to discuss these topics. If it comes to a point revisions need to be made, they will do so. He believes the District's main responsibilities are two-fold: to ensure students are safe as they travel to and from school, as well as while they are in school; and the biggest responsibility is student achievement in which a lot of issues need to be addressed. He did not believe a lot of time should be spent on this item and reiterated that they could come back and modify the organization chart if needed.

Mrs. Good concurred with her colleagues and wanted assurances that the Board would receive an update from Mr. Runcie and Mr. Moquin pertaining to their meeting with the fire officials by the next School Board Meeting on July 28, 2015.

Ms. Korn asked in regards to page 15 of the organizational chart, what the safety impact would be at schools regardless if there were any changes to the position.

Mr. Moquin replied there would be no difference.

Ms. Korn there were a difference on the safely of the students, the Board would need to know. If there was no difference, she was troubled that they were spending so much time on it. She asked if there would be any benefit as to who the person reported.

Mr. Moquin responded he would not recommend taking this position and elevating it to a director, but rather to review at the functionality as to what made sense. He recommended approving this item to ensure in the interim someone would have the designation of Chief Fire Official.

Ms. Korn said what she has heard pertained to the position either above or below the line. The difference above the line would be a pay grade from a C to a D and they would report to the Chief of Staff instead of the Director of Risk Management. Whether it was left as is or changed, she would like to hear the argument for the reason and the benefit it would bring to the District. She would not want the Superintendent to make a commitment if something else would come before the Board. This is his organizational chart and she did not want to force him his hand. He needs to be empowered to do what he thinks would be necessary. If staff comes back to the Board, she would like to know the added value and the safety for the children. If staff does not come back to the Board, Ms. Korn would like the Board to receive a memo that states staff had explored this and believes it was the highest level of safety.

Mrs. Bartleman remarked her colleague's comments were interesting. She thinks the Auditor should report to the Board and not the Superintendent and the Chief Fire Official should stand-alone.

Mrs. Good was looking for something to come back and was unhappy with the way this was currently. She asked the General Counsel to share what input would be allowed from the Board.

Mr. Carland replied when it pertains to the organizational chart, the Board has discretion to dictate changes if it is the Board's will. In the case for personnel appointments where the Superintendent is nominating a person to fill a position, the Board would be restricted by the good cause finding discussed. When it comes to making changes to a proposed chart or job descriptions, the Board would not have that restriction. If the Board ultimately makes those changes, the Superintendent would have to implement the changes.

Mrs. Good was perplexed that if this were not approve today, the District would be in a situation where there was not a position to deal with the fire and safety.

Mr. Moquin stated there were safety specialists that continue to do joint safety and fire inspections. There would not be an individual to serve as the ultimate interpreter of the fire code and would have to rely on local jurisdiction wherever there was a fire issue.

Mrs. Good commented that was a concern. She saw a downside by not having another look at this position. She stated she would like to make a motion following the public input.

The Chair received input from the audience on this motion.

Following input from the audience, Mrs. Good requested to postpone Agenda Items CC-5 and II-3 until the July 21, 2015 Special School Board Meeting.

Motion to Postpone

Motion was made by Mrs. Good, seconded by Mrs. Rupert to postpone items CC-5 and II-3 until the July 21, 2015 Special School Board Meeting. This motion was superseded by Amended Motions to Postpone (pages 43 and 44).

Mrs. Bartleman questioned why all the job descriptions in CC-5 would be postponed instead of separating the Chief Fire Official and voting on the rest.

Ms. Korn suggested a friendly amendment to postpone item II-3 and speak to CC-5, separating the one job description from the others, which Mrs. Good accepted.

After discussion, Mrs. Good amended her motion as follows:

Amended Motion to Postpone

Motion was made by Mrs. Good, seconded by Mrs. Rupert to postpone item II-3.

Mrs. Bartleman asked what the impact would be on the construction timeline if relying on the municipalities. In addition, how long would it take for them to arrive.

Mr. Messier said there would be no impact.

Mr. Carland clarified the organizational chart is a pictorial description of positions the Board has created and who they report to in the District. The reporting structure is something the Board designates to the job descriptions, so the organizational chart should come simultaneous with or after the job descriptions are changed or created.

Mr. Carland said it is within the job description that the Board dictates who reports to whom. The organizational chart is a reflection of what is in the job description, in terms of reporting structure. If the Board wanted to make a change to reflect the reporting structure on the organizational chart, it may do so; however, the Board needs to address it in the job descriptions.

Ms. Korn remarked the organizational chart would need to reflect any changes in the job descriptions made by the Board. If changes were made, it would be incumbent upon the Superintendent to bring back an organizational chart that reflected those changes in the job descriptions.

After discussion, Mrs. Good made a friendly amendment to her amended motion as follows:

Amended Motion to Postpone (Carried)

Motion was made by Mrs. Good, seconded by Mrs. Rupert and carried, to postpone item II-3, page 15 until the July 21, 2015 Special School Board Meeting. Dr. Osgood was absent. Mrs. Bartleman voted "no." (7-1 vote)

The Chair received input from the audience on this motion.

Mrs. Good responded to comments from the audience and stated that she appreciates comments from the public; however, the reason she questions what comes before the Board is because she does not want to cross the line and looks to Mr. Carland for guidance as to when they are allowed to do something and when they are not allowed. She takes everything extremely seriously and has great confidence in the Superintendent and staff. If there is something she does not agree with, she makes a point to voice it. The Board took a long time to discuss this issue because it was important to them. She wanted to allow the Superintendent and his staff the opportunity to meet with professionals and fire officials to look at this matter further because there could be opportunities to revise this organizational chart in a manner that all involved felt would be in the best interest of the students of this District.

The Chair received further input from the audience on this motion.

Ms. Korn stated what may appear as a weakness to the public from this Board in asking legal for direction, is because the last thing the Board wants to do, is something just because they want to be empowered rather than they are empowered. If the public hears the Board asking questions of legal, it is because its job is to do things as statute has outlined. In this case, legal advised the Board what it was empowered to do, and what was on the floor was just that, using that power to separate an item, get further information on it, and then take action.

Ms. Korn said she was glad the public was listening, voicing their opinions, and asking the Board to do things. She was also glad that the Board was listening and doing just that.

The Chair received further input from the audience on this motion.

Following a vote on the Amended Motion to Postpone, a vote was taken on the remaining II-3 item, page 7. Dr. Osgood was absent. (8-0 vote)

In regards to item CC-5, Mrs. Bartleman wanted to elevate the position of Chief Fire Official as a direct report to the Superintendent. She did not believe that position should report to Risk Management and felt the position should stand alone, with no one above them second-guessing their decisions. Mrs. Bartleman made the following motion:

Third Motion to Amend (Failed)

Motion was made by Mrs. Bartleman to change the reporting structure to the position of Manager, Emergency Management & Chief Fire Official as a direct report that reports directly to the Superintendent. The motion failed for lack of a second.

Mrs. Levinson appreciated what her colleague was trying to accomplish but since the item II-3, page 15 had been postponed, she did not feel further conversation on the position was needed until the Superintendent had reviewed it and brought it back to the Board at the July 21, 2015 Special School Board meeting.

Motion to Separate and Postpone (Carried)

Motion was made by Mrs. Good, seconded by Mrs. Levinson and carried, to separate CC-5, Job Description C-024, Manager, Emergency Management & Chief Fire Official, and postpone until the July 21, 2015 Special School Board meeting. Dr. Osgood was absent. (8-0 vote)

A vote was taken on the Motion to Separate and Postpone.

Mrs. Brinkworth had a question regarding the CIO job description and the items with language that was inadvertently left out on page 169. She asked staff if they had that language.

Mr. Anderson said the language should have read under Preferred Qualification, Experience: A minimum of ten (10) years within the last fifteen (15) years of increasingly responsible executive experience including five (5) years or more of successful direct management of a major Information Technology (IT) operation. Two (2) or more IT certifications to include PMP or ITIL and CGCIO, CETL, or CISSP preferred. Similar or comparable certifications will be considered.

Mrs. Brinkworth asked that the Superintendent follow-up with staff to ensure this item was reviewed in its entirety and that there were no other items inadvertently omitted. She expressed her disappointment that something was removed and not shown as a strike-through. Mrs. Brinkworth made the following motion:

Fourth Motion to Amend (Carried)

Motion was made by Mrs. Brinkworth, seconded by Mrs. Rupert and carried, to amend the Chief Information Officer by adding back the language at the end of the Job Description, page 169, Preferred Qualifications, Experience: "A minimum of ten (10) years within the last fifteen (15) years of increasingly responsible executive experience including five (5) years or more of successful direct management of a major Information Technology (IT) operation. Two (2) or more IT certifications to include PMP or ITIL and CGCIO, CETL, or CISSP preferred. Similar or comparable certifications will be considered." Mrs. Freedman and Dr. Osgood were absent for the vote. (7-0 vote)

A vote was taken on the Fourth Motion to Amend.

Ms. Korn pointed out on page 170, under Required, there was an error on spacing after the first paragraph. She asked to staff ensure it was just a spacing error and that nothing was missing.

A vote was taken on the remaining CC-5 item as amended.

DD. OFFICE OF THE CHIEF AUDITOR

EE. OFFICE OF STRATEGY & OPERATIONS

EE-1. Second Amendment to Agreement and Additional Spending Authority - 14-037V - Federal and State Lobbying Services (Approved)

Motion was made by Mrs. Rupert, seconded by Mrs. Brinkworth and carried, to approve the Second Amendment to Agreement and an additional spending authority for the above contract. Contract Term: July 1, 2015, through June 30, 2016, 1 Year; User Department: Public Information Office; Award Amount: \$547,581; Awarded Vendor(s): Alcalde & Fay, Ltd.; Becker & Poliakoff, P.A.; and Colodney Fass, PA; M/WBE Vendor(s): None. Dr. Osgood was absent. Mrs. Rich Levinson abstained from the vote. (7-0 vote)

The School Board of Broward County, Florida (SBBC) solicited lobbying services for a three (3) year term on December 2, 2013, and entered into agreement and a First Amendment to the agreement with Alcalde & Fay, Ltd.; Becker & Poliakoff, P.A.; and Colodny, Fass, Talenfeld, Karlinsky, Abate & Webb, P.A., on December 12, 2013, and June 24, 2014, under RFP 14-037V, Federal and State Lobbying Services.

See Supporting Docs for continuation of Summary Explanation and Background.

A copy of the RFP documents are available online at:
<http://www.broward.k12.fl.us/supply/agenda/14-037V-Federal-State-Lobby-Service.pdf>

These Second Amendment to Agreements have been reviewed and approved as to form and legal content by the Office of the General Counsel.

The estimated financial impact will be \$204,000. All expenditures for this contract will come from the existing approved Public Information Office budget.

Mrs. Rupert inquired what the total spend would be including this year and if the District would stay under the \$547,581.

Sheela VanHoose, Director, Legislative Affairs, responded the Board was being asked to approve \$204,000 for the three lobbying contracts this year.

Mrs. Rupert believed the original award amount was \$343,581 to run through 2016 and appeared it was now being thrown out.

Mrs. VanHoose disagreed and stated when they first signed the contracts they only did so for one year. The Board only voted for a spending authority for each year.

Mrs. Rupert stated the award amount was \$547,581 and based on that RFP where would the District be in the total spend after three years. Adding the \$303,581 for purchase orders to the \$204,000 for lobbying contracts, equates to \$505,581.

Mrs. VanHoose said this was the District's last year and they would go out for renewal bid sometime next year.

Mrs. Rupert's point was that the District was still under the \$547,581. Her second question pertained to the contract for Colodney Fass, PA where they asked for \$75,000 and the District would give them \$72,000, and wanted to know if they were okay with that decision.

Mrs. VanHoose replied yes. They increased the Colodney firm to equal the Becker firm because they were doing equal partnership, 50/50 in the work.

Mrs. Rupert wanted to ensure that although they sent something back for \$75,000, they agreed to \$72,000 to which staff confirmed.

Mrs. Good asked since the work was being disbursed differently now, was it spelled out anywhere in the agreement or if the parties have been advised of their responsibilities in writing.

Mrs. VanHoose said they have been advised. It was in both Colodney and Becker's contracts and in the evaluation memo sent out to everyone prior to session.

Mrs. Good applauded Mr. Runcie's staff and entire team that were part of the lobbying services. She also heard from legislatures how much they appreciate the positive feedback they had been receiving from Broward County Public Schools.

Mrs. Rich Levinson stated considering the opinion of the Ethics Commission, she would be abstaining from voting in abundance of caution as her husband was employed by one of the firms.

The Chair received input from the audience on this item.

Mrs. Good said the lobbyists are in place to in the District's behalf regarding legislative proposals the Board has discussed. They were also very supported to the students on a trip to Tallahassee.

Mrs. VanHoose elaborated further by saying the lobbying team was a very instrumental on the trip for the 50 students that went.

A vote was taken on the item.

EE-2. Bid Recommendation of \$500,000 or Greater - 16-013B - Paper and Plastic Items for Cafeterias (Approved)

Motion was made by Mrs. Rupert, seconded by Mrs. Brinkworth and carried, to approve the recommendation to award the above contract. Contract Term: July 1, 2015, through September 30, 2016, 1 Year, 3 Months; User Department: Food and Nutrition Services (FNS); Award Amount: \$1,500,000; Awarded Vendor(s): All Florida Paper; Calico Industries of Florida, LLC; Dade Paper and Bag Company; Edward Don and Company; Daxwell; Ideal Supply, Inc.; Interboro Packaging Corporation; Peninsular Paper Company; Rainmaker, Inc.; and Southeastern Paper Group of Florida; M/WBE Vendor(s): Ideal Supply, Inc.; Interboro Packaging Corporation; and Rainmaker, Inc. Dr. Osgood was absent. (8-0 vote)

The School Board of Broward County, Florida, received fourteen (14) bids for 16-013B -Paper and Plastic Items for Cafeterias. The Food and Nutrition Services department purchases various paper and plastic cafeteria items to provide utensils for eating, as well as products to be used in cafeterias to prepare and store food. This contract offers the options for the commodities to be shipped from the District's Central

Warehouse or directly from the vendor to schools, centers, and other locations throughout the District.

See Supporting Docs for continuation of Summary Explanation and Background.

A copy of the bid documents are available online at:
http://www.broward.k12.fl.us/supply/agenda/16-013B_Paper_Plastic_Items_for_Cafeteria.pdf

The estimated financial impact will be \$1,500,000; funds will come from FNS's Operating Budget.

No discussion was held on this item.

EE-3. Bid Recommendation of \$500,000 or Greater - 15-071F - Roofing Services (Approved)

Motion was made by Mrs. Rupert, seconded by Mrs. Brinkworth and carried, to approve the recommendation to award the above contract. Contract Term: June 24, 2015, through June 23, 2018, 3 Years; User Department: Physical Plant Operations; Award Amount: \$750,000; Awarded Vendor(s): Atlas-Apex Roofing, LLC, and Decktight Roofing Services, Inc.; M/WBE Vendor(s): None. Dr. Osgood was absent. (8-0 vote)

The School Board of Broward County, Florida, received six (6) bids for 15-071F - Roofing Services. A contract is being awarded (by group) to the two (2) lowest responsive and responsible bidders meeting the project specifications; \$750,000 (\$375,000 for each vendor). Physical Plant Operations utilizes this contract on an as needed basis to inspect, service, maintain, and repair roofs at schools and administrative sites throughout the District.

A copy of the bid documents are available online at:
<http://www.broward.k12.fl.us/supply/docs/contracts/ITB 15-071F-Roofing-Services.pdf>

The estimated financial impact will be \$750,000; funding for this item will come from the Physical Plan Operations' budget. Other funding sources in the District's budget may be used if the project and/or work-order is included in a school or department's budget.

No discussion was held on this item.

**EE-4. Direct Negotiation Recommendation of \$500,000 or Less - 55-128E -
Kinetic Request Solution (Approved)**

Motion was made by Mrs. Rupert, seconded by Mrs. Brinkworth and carried, to approve the recommendation to award for the above contract. Contract Term: June 24, 2015, through June 23, 2016, 1 Year; User Department: Information & Technology; Award Amount: \$343,660; Awarded Vendor(s): JDL Technologies, Inc.; M/WBE Vendor(s): None. Dr. Osgood was absent. (8-0 vote)

The School Board of Broward County, Florida, has rolled out the Remedy Incident Management Requestor Console portal to approximately 80 schools as part of the Digital Infusion Initiative. The current Requestor Console is limited in functionality and will need to be replaced by the Kinetic Request Solution application in order to accommodate current technical staff at schools sites, District offices, students, and parents at some point in the future.

This Agreement has been reviewed and approved as to form and legal content by the Office of the General Counsel.

The financial impact to the District is \$343,660 for a one (1) year period. The funding will come from Information & Technology's Operating Budget.

Mrs. Brinkworth wanted to confirm there was only one (1) response out of the 608 vendors and asked what the reason might have been for one response.

Mrs. Crenshaw said that was correct.

Anthony Hunter, Chief Information Officer, stated it was hard to speculate why there was just one response. It was a specialty tool that worked directly with the District's call desk center, called Remedy. There was not a huge selection of vendors who write the portal for this item. It could be that in the vendor pool, there were only a limited number of people who actually provide the software.

Mrs. Brinkworth referred to the back-up that stated there were 608 vendors, which made it sound like it could have been bid on by a lot of people, but from the explanation given, she understood why due to lack of technology needed for the requirements. She still did not like the idea of only one (1) bid coming in and would like staff to determine what could be done to remedy that for the next time.

Mrs. Rich Levinson encouraged staff to do what Mr. Messier rolled-out as to what he was trying to accomplish in order to get more vendors.

Mr. Hunter assured the Board he has already had that conversation with Mrs. Crenshaw and her office and will be reaching out in the future to remedy the situation.

Ms. Murray suggested staff ask the companies that could have bid on this and chose not to, what was the reason. The feedback is important so the District gets the right service at a good price.

Ms. Korn asked Mr. Hunter to work with Mrs. Crenshaw on anything recent with a direct negotiation to ensure they are on the vendor list the next time.

A vote was taken on the item.

EE-5. Sole Source Recommendation of \$500,000 or Greater - 55-130E - Pinnacle Gradebook Software Application (Approved)

Motion was made by Mrs. Rupert, seconded by Mrs. Brinkworth and carried, to approve the recommendation to award for the above contract. Contract Term: July 1, 2015, through June 30, 2018, 3 Years; User Department: Information & Technology; Amount Awarded: \$975,281; Awarded Vendor(s): Wazzle, LLC; M/WBE Vendor(s): None. Dr. Osgood was absent. (8-0 vote)

This request is to approve the sole source agreement with Wazzle, LLC, for Pinnacle Gradebook Software Application products and services to be utilized District-wide. The District has been using the Pinnacle Gradebook as its electronic teacher gradebook since 1999, when it was adopted for use in our high schools. Pinnacle Gradebook Solution provides a secure management utility for teachers to record attendance, grades, and is a real time source of information for principals, parents, and students. Pursuant to School Board Policy 3320, Section II, I, which states, "Commodities or contractual services available only from a single source are exempt from the competitive solicitation requirements."

See Supporting Docs for continuation of Summary Explanation and Background.

This Agreement has been reviewed and approved as to form and legal content by the Office of the General Counsel.

The estimated financial impact to the District will be \$975,281 for a three (3) year period. The funding source will be from Information & Technology's Operating Budget.

Mrs. Bartleman asked if elementary parents could view their child's grades on Pinnacle online.

Mr. Hunter responded that has been a decision at the school level as to how grades are available to parents. He could look into that and have further discussion principals to determine how to accomplish that, but it has nothing to do with the Gradebook. All the data is in the Gradebook.

Mrs. Bartleman said parents want to be able to look up grades in real time and they have not had the ability to do that at the elementary level. She asked Mr. Hunter to research that process and to respond in writing whether or not that service could be provided for those parents.

Ms. Korn asked at what point would the service be accessible to elementary parents and a requirement for teachers to enter the grades.

Mr. Hunter stated that would be a conversation he would have to have in collaboration with the Curriculum department and OSPA. They would need to discuss with the principals how to make that available. It is not a limitation of the system; it is just not part of the current business process.

Ms. Korn, along with other parents, thought it was being rolled out in year one and would be incorporated across the District. She would like to know the direction this is going within the District and a timeframe as to when it might be completed.

Mr. Hunter replied he would research that and respond back to the Board. He also mentioned if it could not be completed together at one time, it would create confusion. There would still be some work to do in order to ensure the teachers have the ability to input all the grades and information on a daily basis for parents to review. Additional work would be needed to make sure the system is ready and that it would add value as opposed to creating confusion for the parents.

Mrs. Rich Levinson asked if the price was inclusive if the District moves forward.

Mr. Hunter responded this price was actually to maintain the Gradebook and the parent portal would be a part of it, so there would be no additional costs.

Mrs. Bartleman referred to Mr. Hunter's comment about teachers being required to input their grades daily and he implied that would be a problem. If a teacher has essays, they are not always putting the grades in daily but are given time to grade them. It should not be looked at a negative or reason for not having it.

Mr. Hunter replied he did not suggest it would be a problem but suggested as a system they would have to put protocols in place in order to be consistent.

Mrs. Bartleman asked if kindergarten was in Pinnacle.

Mr. Hunter stated grades K-2 could be put in Pinnacle as well and would be included in the costs.

A vote was taken on the item.

**EE-6. Bid Extension and Recommendation for Additional Spending
Authority - 29-053T - Inspection & Repair of Fire Sprinkler Systems
(Approved)**

Motion was made by Mrs. Rich Levinson, seconded by Mrs. Brinkworth and carried, to approve the recommendation for additional time and additional spending authority for the above contract. Contract Term: October 1, 2008, through June 30, 2015, 6 Years, 9 Months; User Department: Physical Plant Operations (PPO); New Award Amount: \$168,450; Awarded Vendor(s): Simplex Grinnell, LP; M/WBE Vendor(s): None. Dr. Osgood was absent. Mrs. Good voted "no." (7-1 vote)

The School Board of Broward County, Florida, approved a contract award for Bid 29-053T, Inspection & Repair of Fire Sprinkler Systems, on September 23, 2008. The contract award was \$2,180,000 for services from October 1, 2008, through June 30, 2015. This request is to approve the additional spending authority of \$168,450, and an extension of 60-days (July 1, 2015, through August 31, 2015). The current contract expires on June 30, 2015.

See Supporting Docs for continuation of Summary Explanation and Background.

A copy of the bid documents are available online at:
http://www.broward.k12.fl.us/supply/docs/contracts/29-053T_INSPECTION_AND_REPAIR_OF_FIRE_SPRINKLER_SYS.pdf

The estimated financial impact will be approximately \$168,450; funding for this item will come from the PPO's budget. The financial impact represents an estimated contract value; however, the amount authorized will not exceed the bid award amount.

Agenda items EE-6 and EE-7 were discussed concurrently.

Mrs. Good stated on EE-6 the request was for addition time and spend authority. She asked staff if they did not know there were issues moving forward when it came before the Board in February 2015. She asked why did staff not go out to bid if additional time was going to be a particular issue.

Mrs. Crenshaw replied they thought a new bid would be in place by the end of the contract term, but they were behind in their bidding process. They are requesting an extension so they would have time to go back out and bid.

Mrs. Good remarked that information was missing from the summary and was a key component as to why staff was requesting the additional time. She asked the Superintendent to ensure those kinds of explanations would be included and also the expectation when staff would want the bid to be out. She asked staff if they had a time schedule moving forward.

Mrs. Crenshaw responded they should have it before the 60-day expiration period, which would occur before August 31, 2015.

Mrs. Good asked if the additional spend request of \$168,450 was enough to get through the next two months.

Mr. Bays answered that was correct. The fire/sprinkler inspection world was increasingly complex. A couple years ago it was handled in-house. Now it must be handled by a fire/sprinkler contractor, which adds to the scope of work. In addition, there was a newly enforced protocol for a five (5) year inspection that was invasive and intense. The fire/sprinkler system and had to be dismantled to look for obstructions and calcifications inside the lines, so it is much more complex and expensive than the annual quarterly's they have been operating under. In short the money would be necessary due to a laundry list of inspections that must be completed this summer.

Mrs. Good expressed she did not like the Board being put in a position to approve additional time had staff gone out for a bid. Regarding item EE-7, she asked staff if it was a piggyback contract.

Mrs. Crenshaw said it was not a piggyback but a bid that they went out for and only received one bid that was awarded for one year. She said they wanted to review the specifications to encourage more participation and were requesting more time so they could complete the bid documents.

Mrs. Good asked why staff was asking for so much time to re-bid, 180 days.

Mrs. Crenshaw replied many of the Physical Plant Operations (PPO) bids were expiring at the same time and they were backed up in terms of trying to get their bids completed. The additional time would allow them to get everything in place.

Referring to the page titled The School Board of Broward County, Florida, Procurement & Warehousing Services, Mrs. Good noted the contract period was August 1, 2014 through July 31, 2015 with an option of (2) one year renewals. She asked staff why that was not considered.

Approved in Open Board Meeting September 16, 2015

Mrs. Crenshaw stated they wanted to go out for bids on the renewal in order to obtain better pricing and decided to renew it with only vendor. If they were able to get it awarded before expiration, they would cancel the bid and move forward.

Mrs. Good commented the impact would be increased another \$225,000, bringing it to almost \$750,000.

Mrs. Crenshaw responded they were also reviewing the spend, which was more than they anticipated. When that happens, they try to go out for bid to determine if they could get better pricing.

Mrs. Good felt this was excessive. The Board needed to know if there was not ample staffing to handle these issues. She reiterated she did not like the position the Board was being placed having to continue to approve contract amounts to deal with issues related to staffing.

Mrs. Brinkworth said her question was also why EE-6 and EE-7 were not re-bid. She asked staff if everything would be done in time on EE-6 or would staff be returning to the Board.

Mrs. Crenshaw replied they anticipate the money would cover the services for that time. When they receive a new bid, it would include a new allocation. If additional funding were needed, it would go on the new bid.

Mrs. Brinkworth referred to EE-7 and the answer given to her colleague about having only one vendor bid and needing more time to review. She felt they had a year to review and to look at why there was only one vendor. If it was because of staffing issues, that should be looked at closer. Mrs. Brinkworth felt she was having the same conversations she had when she came on the Board with regards to why the contract was being extended and more spend authority being requested, rather than rebidding or putting it out for a new bid.

Mrs. Crenshaw responded they were rebidding it and she new for a fact that this one was not completed. They were asking for six months but it might not take that long. This would allow for some leeway so they would not have to come back to the Board.

Mrs. Brinkworth stated her question was if staff had a year or whatever period the contract was for, someone should be responsible for reviewing these questions, i.e., why there was only one vendor bid. Mrs. Brinkworth felt the real issue was to know why the extensions and additional spend keep reoccurring, and whether it was because of staffing issues, process issues, or something else. She wanted to know why the Board was at this point so often.

Mr. Runcie replied he believed it was a number of contributing factors. There were a lot of contracts that needed to be cleaned up to reflect changes in policy. In addition, there were a number of vacancies in Purchasing that had impacted their capacity to move on this work. There have also been a number of retirements and transfers in that department, along with organizational changes in the last year. Staff is trying to be realistic in setting expectations with this Board on what they can commit to and deliver on, given the workload they have and ensuring quality work.

Mrs. Brinkworth shared her concern was with the bond and the procurement that would have to happen in the next five years. She believed the District needed to be pro-active.

Mr. Runcie agreed, but said that was a whole other set of priorities and they are trying to keep that scope of work very significant. There is a lot to address and to prioritize and they will continue to do the best they can.

Mrs. Brinkworth inquired if there was an ability to track and flag when contracts were expiring that had previously been discussed.

Mr. Runcie answered yes.

Ms. Korn stated the requested amount of money in EE-6 was significant and was supposed to come from the PPO budget. She questioned if the PPO anticipated the costs to go up so significantly and if they had budgeted for those costs.

Mr. Bays responded they could cover this item. There are others where additional money would have to be moved into the budget.

Ms. Korn requested when items such as this come to the Board stating the money would come from X budget, she requested the verbiage say the money would come from "within the approved budget" or if additional money would be have to be added, it should say "through additional funds that will be required in this budget." When it reads as is, it appears the department was expecting the costs and had it in their budget, only to find out at the end of the year they are over their budget. Anytime there is a possibility something may go over budget, she would like that reflected.

The Chair received input from the audience on these items.

A vote was taken on the items.

EE-7. Bid Extension and Recommendation for Additional Spending Authority -15-040R -Water Treatment Chemicals (Approved)

Motion was made by Mrs. Rupert, seconded by Mrs. Brinkworth and carried, to approve their commendation for additional time and additional spending authority for the above contract. Contract Term: August 1, 2014, through July 31, 2015; User Department: Physical Plant Operations; Award Amount: \$225,000; Awarded Vendor(s): Chem-Aqua, Inc.; M/WBE Vendor(s): None. Dr. Osgood was absent. Mrs. Good voted "no." (7-1 vote)

The School Board of Broward County, Florida, received one (1) bid for 15-040R, Water Treatment Chemicals. This request is to approve the additional spending authority of \$225,000 and an extension of 180-days (August 1, 2015, through January 31, 2016). The current contract expires on July 31, 2015.

A copy of the bid documents are available online at:
<http://www.broward.k12.fl.us/supply/docs/contracts/15-040R-water-treatment-chemicals.pdf>

The estimated financial impact will be \$225,000; funding for this item will come from the Physical Plant Operations' budget. Other funding sources in the District's budget may be used if the project and/or work order is included in a school or department's budget. The financial impact represents an estimated contract value; however, the amount authorized will not exceed the bid award amount.

Agenda items EE-7 and EE-6 were discussed concurrently.

The Chair received input from the audience on these items.

A vote was taken on the items.

EE-8. Recommendation for Additional Spending Authority - 14-018R - Supply and Install Sod (Approved as Amended)

Motion was made by Mrs. Rupert, seconded by Mrs. Brinkworth and carried, to approve additional spending authority for the above contract. Contract Term: November 1, 2013, through December 31, 2016, 3 Years, 2 Months; User Department: Physical Plant Operations; New Award Amount: \$750,000; Awarded Vendor(s): Odums Sod, Inc.; M/WBE Vendor(s): Odums Sod, Inc. This motion was superseded by a Motion to Amend (page 61). Mrs. Korn and Dr. Osgood were absent for the vote. (7-0 vote)

The School Board of Broward County, Florida, received one (1) bid for 14-018R, Supply and Install Sod. This request is to approve the additional spending authority of \$400,000 for the term of the contract; the original contract award was \$350,000. The current spending has not been exceeded, however, additional spending is needed to cover the 2015-16 expenditures.

A copy of the bid documents are available online at:
http://www.broward.k12.fl.us/supply/docs/contracts/14-018R_Supply_and_Install_Sod.pdf

The current recommendation is to increase the spending authority to \$750,000. The \$400,000 is coming from Physical Plant Operations' budget. Other funding sources in the District's budget may be used if the project and/or work order is included in a school or department's budget.

Mrs. Rupert had questions on the Executive Summary and Financial Analysis sheet. In reviewing the Financial Analysis sheet, it appeared purchase orders (PO) were sent for \$425,000 and asked if that was correct.

Mr. Bays responded the POs are issued in advance, but the invoices could not exceed the \$350,000 award amount.

Mrs. Crenshaw stated that amount was an error.

Mrs. Rupert expressed that was a problem and would like to table it until the correct information could be presented. In addition, the Executive Summary stated the original spend authority was based on the usual patterns over the past two years, and listed the projects PPO had scheduled to support the request. The \$425,000 POs were the delineated projects, which she supported. Mrs. Rupert asked if the \$400,000 included the \$425,000 POs for delineated projects.

Mr. Bays replied they did not mean to imply that the \$425,000, which was probably an error, represented an encumbrance of money to do the work that was on Executive Summary. If an increase were not received, the work defined would not be able to move forward.

Mrs. Rupert said understood but it put the Board in a very uncomfortable position because they have to work with the information provided, which may or may not be accurate. She wanted the projects to move forward but she needed to know if the \$425,000 was encumbered at all and did the costs exceed the \$350,000 award. She did not feel her questions had been answered and emphasized those kinds of mistakes should not have happened. She asked the Superintendent to look into whether or not more staffing was the problem.

Mr. Runcie asked if staff could have some time to get the answers. This item was about sod and did not reflect anything in the bond. He requested staff to verify the numbers and come back to the Board later in the meeting.

Mrs. Good needed for clarification on the wording on the Executive Summary pertaining to the November 1, 2015 date the bid was approved as a Post Approval with the contract period from November 1, 2013 through December 1, 2016.

Mr. Bays stated the November 1, 2015 date was a scrivener's error and the year should have been 2013.

Mrs. Good wanted to know since coming to the Board in November 2013 up to today, had those dollars already been allocated and thus the request for additional \$400,000.

Ms. Korn pointed out that approximately \$300,000 had been spent with a remaining balance of \$51,000. Staff was asking for an additional \$400,000 because they anticipated that amount would be necessary to complete the work.

Mrs. Good commented the bottom line was that it was brought back to the Board for additional dollars over the original amount. She asked if staff was planning to have this re-bid.

Mrs. Crenshaw replied yes. She also advised the Board that in 2013 when the \$350,000 was approved, there was very little work being performed, and they did not anticipate a lot of work would be done. She said this item would be re-bid when it expires, but until then they needed to continue with the services.

Mrs. Good voiced her concern that the amount was now more than double the original amount requested.

Mrs. Rich Levinson stated she hoped when it went out for a re-bid, there would be more than one vendor. Her concern pertained to the forecasting. She asked if the demolitions were on the books.

Mr. Bays replied no, not for his department to do the demolition for Blanche Ely stadium.

Mrs. Rich Levinson said if that was on the books with the Facilities department, there needed to be greater coordination when these bids go out. Anything PPO plans on doing should be forecast in their numbers going forward so it would not continue to come to the Board for additional spending authority.

Mrs. Rich Levinson asked the Board if they would want a motion to carry the District through the calendar year and if so, she would like to make a motion. She asked staff if the \$130,000 had a contingency included and if not how much would additional money would staff need.

Mr. Bays replied no, there was not a contingency included and they would need approximately 10% more to factor that in the costs.

Motion to Amend (Carried)

Motion was made by Mrs. Rich Levinson, seconded by Mrs. Brinkworth and carried, to amend the spend authority to \$145,000 to carry the District through the calendar year. Ms. Korn and Dr. Osgood were absent for the vote. (7-0 vote)

Mrs. Rich Levinson wanted to follow-up on the discussions earlier that the collaboration by staff would take place in the future.

Following a vote on the Motion to Amend, a vote was taken on the item.

**EE-9. Recommendation for Additional Spending Authority -14-053N -
Musical Instrument Repair (Not Approved)**

Motion was made by Mrs. Rupert, seconded by Mrs. Brinkworth to approve additional spending authority for the above contract. Contract Term: April 15, 2014, through June 30, 2017, 3 Years, 2 Months; User Department: Physical Plant Operations; New Award Amount: \$3,000,000; Awarded Vendor(s): Ace Stuart Music Co. d/b/a Wellington Music Suppliers; All County Music, Inc.; Manuel Perez Woodwind Repairs; Music Man, Inc.; Music Tech Studios, Inc.; and Summer Arts Sessions, Inc.; M/WBE Vendor(s): Manuel Perez Woodwind Repairs. Mrs. Freedman and Dr. Osgood were absent for the vote. Mrs. Bartleman voted "yes." (1-6 vote)

On June 9, 2014, the School Board approved the bid award for musical instrument repair to five (5) vendors in the amount of \$1,500,000. Current spending authority has not been exceeded, however, additional spending authority is needed to cover expenditures for fiscal year 2015-16. To date, \$971,649 has been expended of the original \$1,500,000. This request is for an additional \$1,500,000 to cover expenditures through the term of the contract.

See Supporting Docs for continuation of Summary Explanation and Background.

A copy of the bid documents are available online at:
[http://www.broward.k12.fl.us/supply/docs/contracts/14-053N
MusicalInstruments Repair.pdf](http://www.broward.k12.fl.us/supply/docs/contracts/14-053N_MusicalInstrumentsRepair.pdf)

The estimated financial impact will be approximately \$1,500,000; funding for this item will come from the Physical Plant Operations' budget. The financial impact represents an estimated contract value; however, the amount authorized will not exceed the bid award amount.

Mrs. Rich Levinson inquired if the additional spend authority for this item was the new money placed in the DEFP for next year.

Joseph Luechauer, Curriculum Supervisor, Music and Performing Arts K-12, said it was not his understanding that it was DEFP money.

Mr. Messier replied this was for repair and maintenance of existing instruments and was different from what was approved for the DEFP. Since this had not been done for a long time, schools began to utilize it very quickly. Before this came close to going over the amount, he wanted to bring it to the back to the Board for additional dollars. They would need to go out for a solicitation that was much larger than this for the DEFP work, which was for music instruments at every school. Since this was similar to roofs and HVAC systems, there was a deferred maintenance of the musical instruments. When the contract became available, schools started using it at a much faster rate than anticipated.

Mrs. Rich Levinson informed staff that it had to be managed much better. Schools cannot be allowed to pull from a bid amount whenever they need; some kind of procedure had to be put into place.

Moving forward, Mr. Messier said before opening additional contract dollars for schools to hit, they would determine what the needs of each school were and then submit orders once in order to manage the dollars more effectively.

Mrs. Rich Levinson agreed but asked how staff came up with the amount given if staff had that had not been done yet.

Mr. Luechauer replied it was based upon a projection from the schools that used the dollars and what was needed to get through to sustain their programs until Procurement had a chance to re-bid.

Mrs. Rich Levinson said that did not address the entire District, only those schools that requested the funds. All of the schools would need to be contacted to determine what they needed.

Mr. Luechauer agreed and stated that was why this was being reconstituted so when the infusion of new equipment was placed in schools, this would be revised at the same time.

Ms. Korn expressed similar concerns as her colleagues. There was contract time left, but if this were originally bid in the \$750,000-\$1,000,000 range there would have been different pricing. For that purpose, she wanted this to be re-bid and proposed authorizing an amount that would get the District through the next six to eight months, depending on what staff required.

Mr. Bays asked if they could provide a timeframe later in the meeting, along with information requested by another Board Member.

Motion to Table (Carried)

Motion was made by Mrs. Rupert, seconded by Mrs. Rich Levinson and carried, to table this item until later in the meeting. Dr. Osgood was absent. (8-0 vote)

A vote was taken on the Motion to Table.

Motion was made by Mrs. Rupert, seconded by Mrs. Rich Levinson and carried to bring EE-8 back to the floor.

The Chair asked if staff had the requested information.

Mrs. Crenshaw stated the information on the financial analysis worksheet was incorrect. The amount of purchase order to date was \$329,000 and at present there was \$21,000 remaining on the contract.

Mr. Bays commented the other request they received from the Board was to determine how much it would cost to expend the remaining amount for through December 31, 2015, which would be about \$130,000.

Mrs. Rich Levinson said the financial analysis worksheets were created by computer from information that is input by someone. She asked how then, the information was wrong.

In this particular case, there was an issue where a PO issued in 2013 that had not been closed out and was still calculating into this number. It was taken out because it did not apply to this amount and that was why there was an error.

Mrs. Rich Levinson remarked that it should have been the responsibility of each department that submitted their data to staff to review that data to ensure the numbers were correct. She stated she relied on those numbers to be correct.

Mr. Runcie agreed and said the department should have gone back to verify their data and at the very least, with a spot-check. The quality assurance had been a step that was missing at today's meeting and he will address it with staff.

Mrs. Rich Levinson informed staff she would not be able to support it that way. She suggested contacting the schools now to see what their needs were and bring this back with a more realistic amount. There was still approximately \$500,000 remaining that could be used in the meantime.

Mr. Runcie agreed and said there should be better planning for forecasting. When an amount is given, it would need to have some logic, data, and facts behind it. Since there were dollars still available, he suggested staff obtain the requested information and bring as another Board item. The Superintendent asked staff if there was any concern with the Board voting the item and staff bringing it back.

Mr. Luechauer responded his main concern was the students would suffer if the instruments could not get to the schools until the end of the school year.

Mrs. Rich Levinson indicated this contract was for another year and there would be an opportunity to go out for bid before then and, in the meantime determine an amount need that was realistic.

Mr. Runcie asked staff what the challenge would be to surveys schools to determine what they needed in repairs over the next year.

Mr. Luechauer replied it would be a projection of them and a lot of times they do not know what would need to be repaired until it needs a repair. Most of it is preventative maintenance and what they are driving towards. They would like to have a preventative maintenance type of contract, rather than a strictly repair type of contract. The schools would be providing an estimate but the time of year would also be a factor. For example, marching bands would have a higher volume of repairs September through November than in the later part of the school year.

Mrs. Bartleman said she understood everyone's concerns but felt this item needed to be supported so the students would not be without instruments.

Ms. Korn informed her colleague that there were approximately five months before it would get to that point.

Mrs. Bartleman stated she would be supporting this item.

Mrs. Good emphasized the Board supports what was being done with the music program, but they needed to have a better understanding of exactly what was needed. She asked staff if the remaining dollars would get them through to the start of the school year, allowing them a chance to survey the schools, in order to get a more accurate estimate of costs.

Mr. Luechauer's understanding was that they did not have access to those dollars until July 1, 2015 and because of that, they did not have the opportunity to send some needed instruments to be repaired over the summer. Those instruments are sitting at the schools now.

Ms. Korn questioned how the money was being spent if it was not obtained until July 1, 2015.

Mr. Bays responded they had to go back to general funds and have an infusion of cash because they ran out of money for this line item in PPO. This was relatively trivial until this year because they never had this type of expenditure until this year. Referring to Mr. Messier's comment earlier, once the contract was opened, the expenditures were ramped up and stripped the fund clean.

Mr. Runcie stated this item should not have been in Facilities. It was a historical issue in terms of how it had been managed. Moving forward, they would put a line item in Mr. Luechauer's department.

Mr. Bays said this was a repair item and came from general funds.

Mr. Runcie referred to Mrs. Good's question and told staff that since they had a few months, they would be given the money without having to wait until July and would have access to the remaining \$500,000. During that timeframe, they should be able to put together a methodology to identify instruments at schools that need to be repaired now and create an estimate based on schools' experience on the wear and tear during the course of the school year. He asked staff if that was feasible and if there were any concerns.

Ms. Korn responded that she was concerned that two issues were being confused: spending authority and budget. For the area of repairs of musical instruments, there was money available from the spend authority but the line item in PPO did not have that much money available.

Mr. Bays said the \$850,000 exceeded their budget of \$400,000 and the received an additional infusion.

Ms. Korn agreed, saying his budget did not align with the spending authority. The \$500,000 was a number put together with a contract as a spending authority. It was not something the District anticipated spending, so this was actually asking to take additional money out of the general fund. In other cases when a department asks for additional spending authority, it is because that money had already been planned for in the department's budget.

Mrs. Rich Levinson stated this was a three-year contract and it still had the 2016-2017 school year. The amount should have been about \$500,000 per year, depending how it was broken up. Now the District had to dig into another \$500,000 in the second year when this was supposed to go through 2017. To her colleague's point, it is very important to ensure the amounts requested align with the future years.

Brian Kingsley, Executive Director, Instruction & Interventions, said he had spoken with Mr. Messier about realigning this process out of PPO into Academics. They already met with the Business Support Center to develop that methodology for the school year ahead to identify specific needs and manage more closely. Their work was moving forward and they would start working with the Business Support Center July 1, 2015. Over the three years, they will infuse approximately \$18 million into new musical instruments and the need would have to dovetail the specific need for repair. They want to ensure through preventative maintenance that the new instruments are kept as new as possible over time so the same scenario does not reoccur in the next five or seven years.

Mr. Kingsley said the \$18 million investment that they were very grateful for did not address all of the musical need in the District today and would not bring every school to standard. The schools will have to prioritize based upon their needs and still deal with some of the old instruments that exist in the District. The need for these dollars is very critical moving forward in order to maintain and flourish in those music departments.

Mrs. Brinkworth asked for clarification that approximately \$1.5 million funding was specified to come from PPO but since PPO did not have the money it would have to come from general funds, in which staff answered she was correct.

Ms. Korn was concerned that money was now available for repairs but without a process. She did not understand why nothing had been put in place to ensure every school would have an opportunity to receive some of the available funds. She hoped whatever the department, if funds become available to them through the bond other funds that were freed up, that there has to be a method and practice in place that allows the schools or departments know funds are available to them. Ms. Korn asked if any of this came out of the schools' budgets or was it always PPO.

Mr. Bays replied to his knowledge it was PPO.

Ms. Korn inquired how staff budgeted that line item.

Mr. Bays responded it was a flat line.

Ms. Korn asked how those dollars were accessed in the past and if there were any checks and balances in place.

Mr. Bays said the schools actually make these calls themselves and handle the repair work. Staff only sees the invoice. There were no checks and balances in place.

Ms. Korn asked staff to elaborate on what the plan was going forward.

Mr. Kingsley stated the plan was still in development but assured the Board, Superintendent, and senior leadership it would be presented and there would be thresholds that had specific needs for each of the schools aligned with the spend that would be infused into the schools with the bond dollars.

Ms. Korn told staff the Board had to know if they needed more spend authority now or if they would prefer to wait until mid or late August after they received feed back from the schools, at which time they would know more on what their needs would be. She suggest staff to provide a spend authority based on what they needed. Ms. Korn asked if staff needed a spend authority beyond the \$500,000 to get them through September.

Mr. Kingsley predicted if they received the \$500,000 in July they would be in a good position to move forward, but would need to address it again four to five months down the road.

Mrs. Rich Levinson asked the Superintendent if there was \$2 million in the general fund to cover the request of \$500,000 that was not budgeted for this year plus another \$1.5 million.

Mr. Runcie responded that they would have to prioritize and review the methodology for this and bring it back to the Board in a context of the other spending authorities that needed to be set. A conversation pertaining to that was scheduled for July.

Mrs. Rich Levinson questioned if the Board was in a position to spend the rest of the authority here to get what was needed to get done and then determine a plan.

Mr. Runcie was believed it could be done, but it would slightly affect the funds available from other priority funding given by the state.

Mrs. Rich Levinson suggested they determine a timeframe for this to come back to the Board and not approve additional spending authority at this time until it is determined where it will come.

Mr. Runcie said the plan would be to conduct a sufficient amount of analysis between now and when this would come back to the Board at the end of July. At that time, they would have an estimate and a rationale of this work to review in the broader context of funds available. He confirmed there were funds to cover this request; it would just be a matter of prioritizing.

Ms. Murray stated it was her understanding that the Financial department was consulted first to get approval on available funds. She questioned if that was still true or did the Board approve the amount first and then allow the Financial department to determine if the money would come from capital or the operations budget.

Mr. Runcie confirmed there would be a conversation with the Finance department. Now that they know what the District's budget would be with the state's funding, they have been able to better prioritize the items that need funding for the Board to review and this would be included on that list. He explained there were funds available for the end of this fiscal year to cover this request as well.

Ms. Murray asked remarked the \$1.5 million did not state where it was coming.

Mr. Runcie suggested if it was the will of the Board, they could vote this item down so he could work with staff to develop some estimates to bring to the Board in August or September. In the meantime, there would be more than \$400,000 released to continue this work.

Ms. Murray stated when an amount of money requested it should state who authorized it and where it would be coming.

Mrs. Brinkworth indicated when the Agenda Request Form (ARF) listed under the Financial Impact that the funding was coming from the PPO, it was misleading because the funds were not available. She requested a better explanation if the line items have already been expended in that budget. Mrs. Brinkworth wanted to know where the money was coming from and wanted to ensure there was a conversation with someone in Budget and Finance to make sure the District had the dollars to spend.

Mr. Runcie responded that this item was poorly written. That explanation will not suffice and it will be brought back as an item that makes more sense and is more comprehensive.

Mrs. Brinkworth would like to ensure future items have been run through some type of check as to whether the line item had fully been expended in that budget and from where the requested funding was expected to come.

Mrs. Rich Levinson added that it should have said it was part of the "approved" budget and "additional money would come from X."

The Chair received input from the audience on this item.

A vote was taken on the item.

EE-10. Recommendation for Additional Spending Authority - 55-046E - Multifunction Products, Printers, Facsimile Equipment, Scanners, Related Software, Supplies, and Services (Approved)

Motion was made by Mrs. Rupert, seconded by Mrs. Brinkworth and carried, to approve the recommendation for an additional year of spending authority. Contract Term: October 22, 2014, through August 3, 2017, 2 Years, 9 Months; User Department: Various Locations; Recommended Award Amount: \$1,200,000; Awarded Vendor(s): Lexmark International, Inc.; M/WBE Vendor(s): None. Dr. Osgood was absent for the vote. Mrs. Good and Mrs. Rupert voted "no." (6-2 vote)

Bid 55-046E was approved on October 20, 2014, with a spending authority of \$500,000 to utilize the State of Florida Department of Management Services' contract for the purchase of multifunction products, printers, fax machines, scanners, related software, supplies, and services.

See Supporting Docs for continuation of Summary Explanation and Background.

A copy of the State of Florida contract is available online at:
http://www.broward.k12.fl.us/supply/agenda/Lexmark_State_of_Florida_Contract_600-000-11-1.pdf

The current recommendation is to increase the spending authority to \$1,700,000; the additional \$1,200,000 will come from school and department operating budgets.

Mrs. Good referred to EE-10 and questioned staff that this was going to be over three times the bid, which was very significant.

Mrs. Crenshaw replied it was significant but to keep in mind it was a piggyback and when they accessed the bid, they were only planning to have it for a short time to purchase printers. The Information Technology (IT) department was going to Management Print Services but changed direction and asked for additional funding until they have determined which route they would take.

Mr. Hunter explained there was only \$10,000 left on the existing spend authority. Schools and departments have dollars in their budgets for their printers. He said they were averaging \$87,000 a month in spend authority through the life of the existing contract. This will be taken out to bid this year, but right now they were buying from the State of Florida contract. They will do a form of solicitation for printers, which would be step one. Mr. Hunter stated step two would be to look at a managed print service solution for the District. When this \$1.2 million spend starts to talk about printing, the initial investment is the smallest total cost of ownership there is to the District. The overall cost of ink and toner over time is where the money is really spent. They will be conducting a proof of concept pilot this year in all departments to determine the return on investment. Based on those results, they would build an RFP to look for those services long-term.

Mrs. Good remarked that this was just approved by the Board in 2014 and asked how staff got the amount so wrong.

Mrs. Crenshaw responded they did not get it wrong because they were only expecting to have it for a short time. The original money was going to be available until IT went to Management Print Services. Since their plans changed, they needed to request additional spend.

Mrs. Good stated this was not a practice she took lightly. She understood the thought process, but at the same time it was a significant amount being requested. She did not want to increase spending authority just to address issues due to a lack of forecasting or in the thought process to where staff was moving forward as a District. The path that was changed was a significant change of path and now the Board was being asked to triple the original amount from \$500,000 to \$1.7 million. Mrs. Good relayed she would not be supporting this item. She suggested to the Superintendent that staff should think a little differently when planning the way strategies are handled within the District's departments. If there is going to be a change of path that requires a significant change, then staff should go out to bid or have further explanation as to what would happen.

Mrs. Rich Levinson agreed with everything her colleague said, but she did not feel the Board had much of a choice. The schools had to be able to buy this equipment and once again the Board was placed in a position that they had repeatedly asked not to be placed, and had no choice.

Ms. Murray stated when the District originally went to the State of Florida contract, the Board was led to believe by staff that by doing so the District would save money. Now this has come back and they are spending more prior to the State of Florida contract than the vendor at that time. She asked how this move was justified.

Mr. Hunter responded that as the year went on and there was a change in direction, staff was waiting for a CIO to come on board and take a look at the proper direction they should be heading as a District. There were a lot of things going on and staff was trying to keep everything afloat. He believes they did a phenomenal job in doing so. What the Board had before them was the most recent historical spend, projected over the next year if they continued at that rate, and what the expected spend would be. There was a commitment to rebid this item this year and it would come back for the Board as a new RFP that has been completely rebid. The numbers will be much more reflective of the reality going forward.

Ms. Murray said a lot of the schools had to buy their equipment instead of leasing them, so the District is locked-in with some of the equipment. The feedback she received from schools regarding purchased equipment was that it had not held up. Teachers constantly complain that their printers do not work, they jam or break down on a regular basis, and various other issues with the equipment schools were stuck with keeping. There has been a dilemma in trying to service the needs of staff and she did not know how to rectify it. In addition, when teachers have to go outside the District to print their schoolwork, there is no reimbursement.

Mrs. Crenshaw replied they did not intend to put the Board in a compromised position, but within the last month at the end of the budget period, they had over \$120,000 in requests from schools who had spent the rest of the money in their budget and had put in for printers, in which staff was not able to process all of the orders. That was where they got to the point of only \$10,000 remaining and made the assessment at that time.

Ms. Murray remarked that was because schools have been told if they do not use the money, they will lose it.

Ms. Korn stated there is a difference when a bid is put out for amount of money different from what was advertised. In this case, staff put out a bid for \$500,000 and if it were bid now, it would be at \$1.2 million. She believes there is different pricing obtained with that kind of quantity.

Mrs. Crenshaw advised the Board they did work with Lexmark to give a bigger discount since the contract was being increased substantially. They reduced their pricing from 3-17% on their printers.

Ms. Korn replied that was great news but asked if there was anyone else that could bid that contract.

Mr. Hunter responded there were a number of suppliers that could bid this contract and promised there would be more than one.

Ms. Korn inquired if the \$1.2 million would get the District through the contract.

Mr. Hunter answered no and that the contract goes through August 2017. The \$1.2 million only gets the District through the next year because they planned to rebid it during this year and bring it back to the Board.

Ms. Korn stated schools have very little flexibility with their budget because they have a high list of needs and are not able to request additional funds. District departments are able to go back to the general fund to draw additional funds. The reason she would support this item was because these were coming from school budgets. She said the department operating budgets were her concern. Ms. Korn asked staff to differentiate how much was set aside for schools and how much was for District operating budgets.

Mrs. Crenshaw indicated she did not have that information with her.

Ms. Korn explained the checks and balances at the school level was a budget they could not exceed. That was not the case with department budgets so it is very different when contracts are approved at the school level. The spending authority is supposed to be one level of the District's checks and balances.

Mr. Hunter said their output strategy for copiers, printers, and such, was something they definitely needed to review and revise in the District. The issues brought up at this meeting are part of a bigger output strategy that would need to be put together for the District on how to accomplish these things. Mr. Hunter firmly believed there were savings that could be seen once they complete that work. It would create a change in the way business is conducted and as in every organization there is an adjustment period. They will not hesitate to bring the Board recommendations that would manage this cost.

Mrs. Good referred to the second page where it stated the remaining spending authority was \$10,000; there were approximately \$120,000 in requisitions on hold; and there was an average monthly expenditure of \$87,000. The additional \$1.2 million requested for the Board to authorize, would get them through an entire year. She asked staff if the Board could authorize enough to get them through the next months and then bid this out since the amount was significantly higher.

Mr. Hunter replied if that were the will of the Board. The existing workload in both IT and Procurement was extremely high now, and he would work very hard with Procurement to get this turned around as soon as possible. Mr. Hunter stated he believed it would take at least six months to turn it around, do it the right way, and get it back to the Board. In addition, with the start of school and the bond equipment, they are all stretched very thin.

Mrs. Levinson commented the Board would like it sooner than later, but she did not want this to come back again for additional spending authority. If the Board had Mr. Hunter's commitment that he would work on the output strategy, along with the other things in the coming year, and there would be a comprehensive package of what would be accomplished, she would be able to support it.

Mr. Hunter responded that would be his recommendation. It goes back to the Superintendent's comments around prioritization, because there is a lot of work to accomplish, and does this rise to the level of importance over some of the other things on the plate.

A vote was taken on the item.

EE-11. RFP Recommendation of \$500,000 or Greater - 15-044V - Research and Program Evaluation Consultant Services (Approved)

Motion was made by Mrs. Rupert, seconded by Mrs. Brinkworth and carried, to approve the recommendation to award for the above contract. Contract Term: July 1, 2015, through June 30, 2018, 3 Years; User Department: Student Assessment and Research; Award Amount: \$600,000; Awarded Vendor(s): 16 vendors; M/WBE Vendor(s): Evergreen Solutions, LLC, and Q-Q Research Consultants, LLC. **See Supporting Docs for continuation of Requested Action.** Dr. Osgood was absent for the vote. (8-0 vote)

The School Board of Broward County, Florida, received eighteen (18) proposals for 15-044V - Research and Program Evaluation Consultant Services. This RFP establishes a pool of sixteen (16) consultants approved to provide research and program evaluation services for the District. District departments contract directly with the approved consultants. Services may include, but are not limited to, data collection, data analysis, instrument development, policy review, and preparation of reports.

A copy of the bid documents are available online at:
<http://www.broward.k12.fl.us/supply/docs/contracts/15-044V-Research-&-Program-Evaluation-Services.pdf>

These Agreements have been reviewed and approved as to form and legal content by the Office of the General Counsel.

The estimated financial impact will be \$600,000. Funding will be primarily provided by grants that require external evaluations for compliance. The financial impact represents an estimated contract value; however, the amount authorized will not exceed the estimated award value without prior School Board approval.

Mrs. Rich Levinson vividly remembered having a conversation about research and evaluation services, asking for additional money, and being told it was figured out comprehensively. She was confused as to why it was brought back to the Board.

Dean Vaughn, Student Assessment & Research, replied when they previously came to the Board it was to get funding for the previously RFP, which expires June 30, 2015. This was a new RFP to supersede the previous RFP.

Mrs. Rich Levinson asked staff if \$600,000 was going to be enough for three (3) years of services.

Mr. Vaughn responded the previous RFP was for \$900,000 for five (5) years, which averaged out to \$180,000 a year. This new RFP is \$600,000 for two (2) years and averages out to \$200,000 per year. There was a slight increase to avoid coming back to the Board and ask for additional funds.

The Chair received input from the audience on these items.

A vote was taken on the items.

EE-12. Piggyback Recommendation of \$500,000 or Greater - 55-125V - Library Materials (Approved)

Motion was made by Mrs. Rupert, seconded by Mrs. Brinkworth and carried, to approve the recommendation to award for the above contract. Contract Term: June 24, 2015, through February 28, 2017, 1 year, 8 Months; User Department: Innovative Learning and Arts Department; Award Amount: \$3,750,000; Awarded Vendor(s): 31; M/WBE Vendor(s): None. **See Supporting Docs for continuation of Requested Action.** Dr. Osgood was absent. (8-0 vote)

This request is for the approval to piggyback the State of Florida's Bid 715-001-07-1 for Library Materials.

A copy of the bid documents are available online at:
<http://www.broward.k12.fl.us/supply/docs/contracts/55-125V-LibraryMaterials.pdf>

The estimated financial impact will be \$3,750,000. Funding for these purchases comes from the general fund, Title I and III grants and state library categorical funds. The financial impact represents an estimated contract value; however, the amount authorized will not exceed the estimated award value.

Agenda items EE-12 and EE-13 were discussed concurrently.

Mrs. Brinkworth referred to the bottom of the Executive Summary on EE-12 and asked staff to confirm if the SMART dollars would not only be for the facilities of the media centers being renovated but also for the books in the libraries. In addition, was there a formula for how much money of the dollars would be spent and allocated for the media renovations.

Lynne Oakvik, Curriculum Supervisor, Library Media, replied they did a historical spend on this contract, based on what school libraries have spent on books over the last eight years. In projecting the budget moving forward, they wanted to allow enough spending authority should schools increase their spending in their newly renovated spaces for books and digital materials. It is school discretion and the money would come from the school budget. It was her understanding the capital funding for renovations might have some FF&E, but normally that would not go to books. They were trying to convey that in that language was that there may be increased spending due to the renovation, but it would not necessarily come from capital.

Mrs. Bartleman asked if the money was being used for books.

Ms. Oakvik responded the way she wrote the spending authority, they wanted to have enough authority to encompass any additional spending above what schools have historically been spending. They did not mean to imply that there would be money for books coming from out the SMART bond. The only money she was aware of would be FF&E that would come with the renovations.

Mrs. Bartleman inquired what the District was doing to move in the direction to give students access to materials online.

Ms. Oakvik replied they have a number of online academic databases, which provide e-Book content. School libraries also purchase their own e-Books using their library funding. They have recommended the *Recommended Spending Guidelines* for library media, which is \$9.60 per student for elementary and middle schools, \$12.80 for high schools, and schools may spend that on any type of format print or digital for their school library.

Mrs. Bartleman inquired if a student was going into fifth grade with one-to-one devices, is staff coordinating a story they all have to read in fifth grade and would they have to go online or would someone tell them where to buy the book. Also, she asked staff to advise if Accelerated Reader was included.

Ms. Oakvik said yes, and that they worked specifically with the D-5 schools and more specifically, with the Library Specialist or principal (if there was not a Specialist at the school), and recommend they align their digital content to meet their instructional needs. In a one-to-one school, they would want more digital E-Books and different materials available, multi-media, and so forth. In addition, with the District contracts, Ms. Oakvik said they try to purchase and make strategic decisions with their subscriptions, like TumbleBooks and Gale Databases, which have a number of free e-Books as well. They also try to utilize and ensure schools are aware of the vast resources available so the schools do not have to make purchases. Accelerated Reader is a program that provides assessment and quizzes based their school collections.

Mrs. Bartleman asked staff if the literacy books required for AP classes were available online.

Ms. Oakvik stated she tries to work collaboratively as possible with all the curriculum departments to be aware and make sure the library resources are aligned with instructional needs. Schools that have these resources could purchase from this contract based on their needs. As far as specific required AP courses, she would have to defer to the Curriculum Supervisors for those areas as to how they are providing access to that content.

Ms. Murray inquired if the workbooks were included along with the reading materials in this contract.

Ms. Oakvik replied no, it was strictly library material, print and digital, and things that would go into a professional selection for teachers. It does not include instructional materials.

The Chair received input from the audience on these items.

A vote was taken on the items.

EE-13. Recommendation of \$500,000 or Less - 55-129E - Destination Knowledge - IDEA Proportionate Share Private Schools Obligations (Approved)

Motion was made by Mrs. Rupert, seconded by Mrs. Brinkworth and carried, to approve agreement with DKMarsh, Inc. Contract Term: June 24, 2015, through June 23, 2016, 1 Year; User Department: Exceptional Student Education; Award Amount: \$240,002; Awarded Vendor(s): DKMarsh, Inc.; M/ WBE Vendor(s): DKMarsh, Inc. Dr. Osgood was absent. (8-0 vote)

Purchasing Policy 3320, Part II H, authorizes the purchase of any type of copyrighted materials, instructional materials, and computer software without competitive solicitations. In response to the District's requirement to provide eligible Broward County private school students with materials and resources through the IDEA Proportionate Share for Private School Obligations, the private schools have requested services from DKMarsh, Inc., for reading, math, and Kinder Musik's new ABC Music & Me program as part of its solution.

This Agreement has been reviewed and approved as to form and legal content by the Office of the General Counsel.

The estimated financial impact to the District will be \$240,002 for a one (1) year period. Funding will be provided by the Individuals with Disabilities Education (IDEA) Grant.

Agenda items EE-13 and EE-12 were discussed concurrently.

The Chair received input from the audience on these items.

A vote was taken on the items.

EE-14. Recommendation of \$500,000 or Less - 56-006E - AcceliPLAN 504 Plan Management System (Approved)

Motion was made by Ms. Murray, seconded by Mrs. Rupert and carried, to approve the recommendation to award for the above contract. Contract Term: June 24, 2015, through June 30, 2016, 1 Year; User Department: Exceptional Student Education and Support Services; Award Amount: \$47,500; Vendor Awarded: Accelify Solutions, LLC; M/WBE Vendor(s): None. Dr. Osgood was absent. (8-0 vote)

Purchasing Policy 3320, Part II, Rule H, authorizes the purchase of any type of copyrighted materials, printed instructional materials, and computer software without competitive solicitations. The AcceliPLAN 504 Plan Management System provides an electronic data base system for case management that tracks the needs of students with disabilities in regards to the Section 504 Plan. The electronic case management system will enhance record keeping by capturing all information and streamlining the entire case management process. This will improve tracking of Section 504 data, provide clear visibility of records, and increase readability for users throughout the District.

This Agreement has been reviewed and approved as to form and legal content by the Office of the General Counsel.

The estimated financial impact will be \$47,500. Funding will be expended from Medicaid funds.

Agenda items EE-14 and EE-15 were motioned together.

No discussion was held on these items.

EE-15. Recommendation to Approve Agreement - 56-001E - Education To Go (ED2GO) (Approved)

Motion was made by Ms. Murray, seconded by Mrs. Rupert and carried, to approve the recommendation to award the above contract. Contract Term: July 1, 2015, through June 30, 2018, 3 Years; User Department: Career, Technical & Adult Education; Awarded Amount: N/A; Awarded Vendor(s): Cengage Learning, Inc.; M/WBE Vendor(s): None. Dr. Osgood was absent. (8-0 vote)

Request to approve of the agreement between The School Board of Broward County, Florida (SBBC) and Cengage Learning, Inc., to make available for SBBC students online education courses available through ED2GO (i.e., course materials, online instructors, course hosting, and evaluation). ED2GO is a provider of turnkey online continuing education programs. Access will be available through a portal available via SBBC's website.

This Agreement has been reviewed and approved as to form and legal content by the Office of the General Counsel.

There is a positive financial impact to the District, as this is a revenue generating service.

Agenda items EE-15 and EE-14 were motioned together.

No discussion was held on these items.

EE-16. Grant Applications - Pre-Submission (Approved)

Motion was made by Ms. Murray, seconded by Mrs. Rupert and carried, to approve the submission of the following grant application: **A.** Florida Department of Education: 21st Century Community Learning Centers 2015-2016 (RFA for Existing Locations), \$252,672 (to be requested) Approve the submission of the following grant application and authorize the Superintendent of Schools or his designee to provide any electronic authorizations necessary to submit the required grant documents: **B.** Head Start/Early Head Start Continuation Application, \$15,073,902 (to be requested). Dr. Osgood was absent. (8-0 vote)

Copies of the grant applications and executive summaries are available at the School Board members' office on the 14th floor of the K.C. Wright Administration Center and online via the Broward Schools eAgenda at: <http://webappe.browardschools.com/eagenda/>

The potential positive financial impact if all projects are awarded is \$15,326,574 from various sources.

Agenda items EE-16 and EE-17 were motioned together.

No discussion was held on these items.

The Chair received input from the audience on these items.

A vote was taken on the items.

EE-17. Grant Applications - Post-Submission

(Approved)

Motion was made by Ms. Murray, seconded by Mrs. Rupert and carried, to approve the submission of the following grant applications (Items A - G): **A.** Florida Diagnostic & Learning Resources System, \$1,408,889 (requested) **B.** National Education Association Foundation - Learning and Leadership Grants, \$5,000 (requested) **C.** National Education Association Foundation - Student Achievement Grants, \$5,000 (requested) **D.** Multiagency Services Network for Students with Emotional/Behavioral Disabilities, \$128,000 (requested). **List continued in the Summary Explanation and Background section below.** Dr. Osgood was absent. (8-0 vote)

E. Title I Part A: Improving the Academic Achievement of the Disadvantaged, \$71,564,100 (requested) **F.** Town of Davie Youth Education and Safety Advisory Committee Grant, \$500 (awarded) **G.** Toyota USA Foundation, \$110,000 (requested)

Copies of the grant applications and executive summaries are available at the School Board members' office on the 14th floor of the K.C. Wright Administration Center and online via the Broward Schools eAgenda at: <http://webappe.browardschools.com/eagenda/>

The potential positive financial impact if all projects are awarded is \$73,221,489 from various sources.

Agenda items EE-17 and EE-16 were motioned together.

No discussion was held on these items.

The Chair received input from the audience on these items.

A vote was taken on the items.

FF. OFFICE OF ACADEMICS

FF-1. Amendment 003 to the Road to Child Outcomes Contract between the Early Learning Coalition (ELC) of Broward County, Florida and The School Board of Broward County (SBBC), Florida (Approved)

Motion was made by Mrs. Bartleman, seconded by Mrs. Rupert and carried, to approve Amendment 003 to the Road to Child Outcomes Contract between the Early Learning Coalition (ELC) of Broward County, Florida and The School Board of Broward County (SBBC), Florida. Dr. Osgood was absent. (8-0 vote)

The District's Early Learning/School Readiness Department under the Early Childhood Education Division oversees the ELC's Road to Child Outcomes grant to support high quality care and education at external childcare providers in the Southern Cluster of Broward County. The original contract was approved by SBBC on 08/20/13 as year one of a five-year term. This amendment renews the grant for the 2015-2016 school year and amends the original contract based on revised grant specifications from the Florida Office of Early Learning.

See Supporting Docs for continuation of Summary Explanation and Background.

This amendment to the contract has been reviewed and approved as to form and legal content by the Office of the General Counsel. ELC will sign this contract following the School Board approval.

The positive financial impact with the renewal of this grant to the District is \$15,263.00 (\$15,263.00 increase from the 2013-2014 grant award of \$827,157.00). The source of fund is the ELC. There is no additional financial impact to the District.

No discussion was held on this item.

The Chair received input from the audience on this item.

A vote was taken on the item.

FF-2. Agreement between The School Board of Broward County, Florida and Carlton Palms Educational Center Inc. (Approved)

Motion was made by Mrs. Brinkworth, seconded by Mrs. Good and carried, to approve the Agreement between The School Board of Broward County, Florida and Carlton Palms Educational Center Inc. Dr. Osgood was absent. (8-0 vote)

Florida Administrative Code 6A-6.0361 - Contractual Agreements with Non Public Schools allows Broward County Public School (District) to contract with a residential facility when another public agency has placed the student for non-educational purposes. Carlton Palms is a residential facility that serves clients referred by agencies of the State of Florida, including but not limited to the Agency for Persons with Disabilities (APD). APD independently agrees to place students at Carlton Palms for non-educational purposes and develops and IEP that provides an appropriate program at one of the District's center schools.

See Supporting Docs for continuation of Summary Explanation and Background.

The agreement has been reviewed and approved as to form and legal content by the Office of the General Counsel.

The source of funding is the student's allocation from Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP). Specific dollar amount is based on the individual student's matrix level at the time of placement at Carlton Palms.

No discussion was held on this item.

**FF-3. Continuation of Agreement with The School Board of Broward County, Florida and Residential Community Mental Health Provider
(Approved)**

Motion was made by Mrs. Rupert, seconded by Mrs. Brinkworth and carried, to approve the Agreement with The School Board of Broward County, Florida and Residential Community Mental Health Provider. Dr. Osgood was absent. (8-0 vote)

The Agreement is renewed on an annual basis. The Agreement provides for the provision of required educational services to youth participating in residential treatment programs operated by Alternate Educational Systems, Inc. This community provider serves students in a residential treatment program that are not able to attend school operated by The School Board of Broward County, Florida (SBBC) district. The educational curriculum is provided by the SBBC district and is integrated into the therapeutic services of the programs. Referrals to the programs come from Department of Children & Families, the courts, parents, medical facilities and physicians. Each provider uses the state definition of medical necessity as a guide to determine individual treatment, education plans and length of stay at each site.

The agreement has been reviewed and approved as to form and legal content by the Office of the General Counsel.

The financial impact is generated and funded through student Full-Time Equivalents (FTE). There is no additional financial impact the District beyond FTE.

Mrs. Good understood the agreement with Alternate Education Systems (AES) was overseen by Whispering Pines and the program required teachers be certified.

Mrs. Clay replied that was correct. One teacher had a temporary certificate and one had a permanent certificate.

Mrs. Good asked who selected the teachers.

Mrs. Clay said the agency selected the teachers.

Mrs. Good stated this item was very different from FF-4 item, in which the District selected the teachers, and asked staff why there was a difference.

Mrs. Clay responded it was her understanding that this contract had been in place for a few years. In talking with the school and agency, she discovered the agency felt they needed someone they would be able to train as far as the behavior strategies that the students needed. In addition, they had concerns about having District teachers as it related to their hours and they type of training required for the program.

Mrs. Good thought that was interesting when the teacher was not even certified and, pursuant to the agreement, they were not only required to have certified teachers, but certified substitutes as well. Mrs. Good asked if that was taking place.

Mrs. Clay replied she could not address the past; however, she did visit the program where she spoke to the director, as well as the owner and staff to advise them this program would be monitored with assistance provided to Whispering Pines during their high-peak times.

Mrs. Good voiced her concern on this agreement. It was nothing like FF-4, which had been functioning very well. She felt this agreement should be operated very similar to the agreement in FF-4, where the District would be providing the educators for those students. These are some of the District's more fragile students and she believed they deserved to have the right educators assisting them and providing the services they needed. Mrs. Good was extremely concerned this agreement had be in place for some time and yet, they have not been fulfilling their end of the bargain as far as the requirements of having the proper educators helping these students. In addition, there were services being provided by the school that were not covered. The ARF stated there was no additional financial impact to the District, but in actuality there were services provided to students that were covered by Whispering Pines and not this contract.

Mrs. Clay responded the services the principal had questions were about the ESE Specialist who spent a lot of time assisting this particular program. Her office has been committed to helping this particular site and school during the high-peak times with staffing, withdrawals, and any other assistance needed to fulfill this contract for the next school year.

Mrs. Good appreciated the answer from staff, but conveyed she would not be able to support this item unless the District is the one selecting the educators and teachers that are certified to ensure students are receiving the proper education. To provide Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) dollars to a program that was not providing teachers the District believed should be there, and with a contract that states specifically what they should have been providing and were not, was a concern to her. Mrs. Good did not believe it would be enough for staff to provide additional assistance. Staff should go back to the agency after revising this agreement to make it more in line with FF-4 so Whispering Pines could oversee a program that had the right teachers at this facility. She asked the Superintendent to ensure the schools were receiving the adequate dollars to deal with this issue. She said Whispering Pines had to fund over \$50,000 to cover the ESE Specialist, psychiatrists, or psychologists and it was not being addressed.

Mr. Runcie stated the budget concerns were addressed for both Whispering Pines and Seagull in the budget conference. He said he spoke to the principals last Friday and it was addressed.

Mrs. Good asked about the issue with the teachers.

Mrs. Clay said both were certified but were not Broward County Public School Teachers.

Mrs. Good questioned why the District was not providing the teachers. At any time they could change the staffing and the same predicament would occur. It was her understanding the teachers were not certified for a long period of time.

Mrs. Clay stated it was not her understanding. She talked with the agency staff, director, and owner and reviewed the contract and some of the expectations. She stated she was committed to helping the situation and advised the agency next year that this was direction the District would be taking.

Mrs. Good asked why it was not being done now and why was it taking an entire year.

Mrs. Clay replied when the concern was brought to her the school year was almost over. In order to start a new school year with a program where students would be placed by Department of Children and Families (DCF), their parents, other agencies, they did not feel it was the best time to make a change and give notice to the agency.

Mr. Runcie said he raised the same issue with staff and they have communicated to the school that the District would work to transitioning towards the change next year so there would be sufficient time to deal with the agency.

Mrs. Good reiterated she did not understand why it was taking a year to make the change and why FF-4 was so drastically different from FF-3. The District had more control with what happens as far as support for the students in FF-4.

Mrs. Clay stated she understood the concern and had experience both ways in the district she came. It took monitoring of the program and that was why they stepped in as a division to say this program would be monitored. She was using the same tools she used before to ensure the agency would follow the contract.

Mrs. Good referred to the substitutes where it stated the agency would employ certified substitutes teachers and wanted to ensure that was in place. She indicated she received positive comments on FF-4, but had serious concerns on how FF-3 was being implemented.

Mrs. Bartleman stated the FF-4 teachers were not from the District, they were Citrus Health teachers.

Mrs. Clay responded that it was her understanding the teachers were from the District.

Mrs. Bartleman said staff needed to include communication with the Broward Teachers Union (BTU) for any District teachers. She indicated that Citrus Health did not have District teachers as of a year ago. In addition, she had read some negative comments in the newspaper on one of the health/mental providers and requested follow-up to ensure the children were being treated properly. If a program is deemed inadequate, it should be closed and alternate placement made for the students.

Mrs. Good respected her colleague's comments but she was told differently and, in fact, FF-4 was functioning very well and had District teachers.

Mrs. Bartleman followed up and stated it may have changed, but when she visited a year ago, the teachers were not from the District.

Mrs. Good asked if the Board could get verification on the concerns raised for FF-3 and FF-4.

Mrs. Clay said the Board had her commitment with AES and that staff had already developed and devised their plan, they have a back-up ESE Specialist to assist during high-peak times, and help to assist in getting report cards to this agency.

Mrs. Good stated the agreement for FF-4 was to commence July 1, 2015 and assumed FF-3 was similar, which did not leave enough time to table this and bring it back. Mrs. Good did not want to leave the students without services and said it was very important that the Board receive follow-up on the issue of concerns that were raised on FF-3 and FF-4. She would like something from the entities in writing that indicates the kind of teachers they have in place, certifications, certified substitutes, and all the requirements of these agreements. If they are not doing these things, the agreement should state otherwise. Mrs. Good did not want to approve an agreement that had wonderful elements in it and then find out students were not receiving those services. She verification on all the terms of the agreements to ensure the services promised were being given and if they were not, the Board would then look at termination or imposing the terms.

A vote was taken on the item.

FF-4. Continuation of Agreements with The School Board of Broward County, Florida and Community Mental Health Providers (Approved)

Motion was made by Mrs. Good, seconded by Mrs. Rupert and carried, to approve the Agreements with The School Board of Broward County, Florida and Community Mental Health Providers. Mrs. Rich Levinson and Dr. Osgood were absent for the vote. (7-0 vote)

The Agreements are renewed on an annual basis. The agreements provide for provision of required educational services to youth participating in residential treatment programs operated by Citrus Health Network, Inc. and Atlantic Shores Hospital, LLC. These community providers serve students in residential treatment programs that are not able to attend a school operated by The School Board of Broward County, Florida (SBBC) district. The educational curriculum is provided by the SBBC district and is integrated in the therapeutic services of the programs. Referrals to the programs come from Department of Children & Families, the courts, parents, medical facilities and physicians. Each provider uses the state definition of medical necessity as a guide to determine individual treatment, education plans and length of stay at each site.

These agreements have been reviewed and approved as to form and legal content by the Office of the General Counsel.

The financial impact is generated and funded through student Full-Time Equivalents (FTE). There is no additional financial impact to the District beyond the FTE.

Mrs. Good stated her comments were the same from FF-3.

Mrs. Bartleman said her comment pertaining to the facility was the same as in FF-3 as well.

A vote was taken on the item.

FF-5. Amendment to the Agreement between Career Source Broward and The School Board of Broward County, Florida, for the Innovative Concepts (iCon) Program (Approved)

Motion was made by Mrs. Good, seconded by Mrs. Rupert and carried, to approve the Amendment to the Agreement between Career Source Broward and The School Board of Broward County, Florida. Dr. Osgood was absent. (8-0 vote)

The contract period is July 1, 2015 through June 30, 2016

The School Board of Broward County, Florida has been awarded a grant in the amount of \$489,819 for the Innovative Concepts iCon Program funded by Career Source Broward from Federal Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act WIOA funds. The program will facilitate validated research based strategies aimed at increasing student achievement and career options for youth by incorporating work readiness, entrepreneurship, financial literacy skills, and life skills.

See Supporting Docs for continuation of Summary Explanation and Background.

This Agreement No. 2014-2015-CR-2335-iCon has been reviewed and approved as to form and legal content by the Office of the General Counsel.

There is a positive financial impact of \$489,819 to the District. The source of funds is the Federal Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act WIOA. There is no additional financial impact to the District.

Agenda items FF-5, FF-6, FF-7, FF-8, and FF-9 were discussed concurrently.

Mrs. Brinkworth requested a list of middle schools in FF-6.

The Chair received input from the audience on these items.

Mrs. Rich Levinson asked if there were any programs like FF-6. She had been waiting for a matrix to see what schools had similar programs.

Mr. Kingsley replied yes, there were lots of other supplemental programs. The focus this year had been primarily on curating literacy resources across the District and developing that matrix and putting a changed strategy around the 230 schools. The changes in protocols were programs that had been historically used at the middle school level for science. This was a pilot for elementary and they were considering expanding the program. They started with six Sprouting STEM schools and saw great results in terms of usage and interest. Mr. Kingsley was interested in how dollars would be used to change the core instruction and was concerned the number of supplemental programs were only used when the initial teaching and learning was not successful. He would like to change the paradox around that to be more narrowly focused on instruction and interventions in the year ahead and felt very confident they would be able to do so. In the meantime, the schools were very interested in these programs and were using them. Framing the conversation around the core instruction of materials is what was important.

Mrs. Rich Levinson did not want it to be just a District decision. She would like to see schools involved in the decisions; however, she would like to narrow the selection.

Mr. Kingsley agreed but said the conversation in starting that strategy at the schools has not been taken very well. They continue to want the discretion at their hands. The stakeholders need to continue to be educated as to what was right, why it was right, and look at the results. There have been small improvements but significant gains are needed. The core instruction for all students will be the gauge to judge in moving forward.

Mrs. Rich Levinson asked when the Board would be able to see what schools have in the science and math areas.

Mr. Kingsley replied he would be able to provide a matrix this summer on literacy, but cannot do that for math and science until another year for the elementary programs.

Mrs. Rich Levinson thanked staff and agreed with the core instruction, stating it should be the focus along with other the programs.

A vote was taken on the items.

FF-6. Agreement with Explore Learning, LLC

(Approved)

Motion was made by Mrs. Good, seconded by Mrs. Rupert and carried, to approve the new agreement with Explore Learning, LLC to provide mathematics and science digital curriculum and professional development services for selected Title I elementary and middle schools. Dr. Osgood was absent. (8-0 vote)

The attached agreement between Explore Learning, LLC and The School Board of Broward County, Florida will provide access to a digital STEM curriculum (Gizmos for selected Title I middle schools and Reflex for selected Title I elementary schools) and professional development to The School Board of Broward County, Florida. Explore Learning, LLC shall provide SBBC with a 24-month license for subscriptions and part time project management for Gizmos and a 12-month license for subscriptions and part time project management for Reflex.

This agreement has been reviewed and approved as to form and legal content by the Office of the General Counsel.

This agreement will be executed after School Board approval.

The total financial impact is \$494,000. Funding is provided by Title 1 grant funds. There is no additional financial impact to the District.

Agenda items FF-5, FF-6, FF-7, FF-8, and FF-9 were discussed concurrently.

The Chair received input from the audience on these items.

A vote was taken on the items.

FF-7. Subcontract Amendment 002 to Partnership for a Healthy & Drug-Free Broward Contract with United Way of Broward County Commission on Substance Abuse

(Approved)

Motion was made by Mrs. Good, seconded by Mrs. Rupert and carried, to approve Subcontract Amendment 002 to continuation of contract with United Way of Broward County Commission on Substance Abuse. Dr. Osgood was absent. (8-0 vote)

Subcontract Amendment 002 with United Way of Broward County Commission on Substance Abuse amends subcontract Amendment 001 to reflect a reduction to fund distribution for school year 2014-15. Cost reimbursement for services provided fell short of estimated fund allocation.

This subcontract amendment has been reviewed and approved as to form and legal content by the Office of the General Counsel. This agreement will be executed after School Board approval.

The positive financial impact is \$124,000, which covers the cost of family counseling services. This funding is provided by United Way of Broward County. There is no additional financial impact to the District.

Agenda items FF-5, FF-6, FF-7, FF-8, and FF-9 were discussed concurrently.

The Chair received input from the audience on these items.

A vote was taken on the items.

FF-8. Agreement between The School Board of Broward County, Florida and The Children's Services Council of Broward County (Approved)

Motion was made by Mrs. Good, seconded by Mrs. Rupert and carried, to approve the Agreement between The School Board of Broward County, Florida and The Children's Services Council of Broward County. Dr. Osgood was absent. (8-0 vote)

See Supporting Docs for continuation of Summary Explanation and Background.

The Agreement has been reviewed and approved as to form and legal content by the Office of the General Counsel.

The transportation cost impact to the District is \$274,147. The positive financial impact to the District from Children's Services Council 21st Century programming is \$3,140.101.

Agenda items FF-5, FF-6, FF-7, FF-8, and FF-9 were discussed concurrently.

The Chair received input from the audience on these items.

A vote was taken on the items.

FF-9. Connect For Success! - Attachment, Attendance & Achievement Pilot: Collaboration with ReServe Elder Service Inc. (Approved)

Motion was made by Mrs. Good, seconded by Mrs. Rupert and carried, to approve consultant agreements with ReServe Elder Service Inc. to provide attendance support services to 12 high-risk Title 1 middle schools. Dr. Osgood was absent. (8-0 vote)

Based on the 2014 Social Indicator of Need report produced by the Student Assessment and Research Department, 12 middle schools were identified as needing intense support services. By rank order, these schools had the highest need index. Seven of these schools were assigned a full time school social worker. For additional support to all 12 middle schools the Student Services Department developed the Connect for Success! Model of practice, pairing school social worker with a ReServist, a retired professional working through ReServe Elder Service Inc. to mentor identified students. The goals of the initiative are to increase the student's average daily attendance, help each student feel connected to school, decrease behavioral infractions, and to improve academic performance as measured by grades and test scores. By achieving these goals, students will be more likely to successfully complete middle school, transition to, and ultimately graduate from high school.

The financial impact is \$144,000. The source of the funds is the Title 1 Graduation Initiative Grant budget. There is no additional financial impact to the District.

Agenda items FF-5, FF-6, FF-7, FF-8, and FF-9 were discussed concurrently.

The Chair received input from the audience on these items.

A vote was taken on the items.

FF-10. Agreement between The School Board of Broward County, Florida and Junior Achievement of South Florida, Inc. (Approved)

Motion was made by Mrs. Rupert, seconded by Mrs. Good and carried, to approve the Agreement between The School Board of Broward County, Florida and Junior Achievement of South Florida, Inc. Dr. Osgood was absent. (8-0 vote)

The contract period is from July 1, 2015 through June 30, 2016.

Junior Achievement of South Florida, Inc. will implement the Entrepreneurial component of the Innovative Concepts iCon Program funded by the Federal Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA) Grant through the Broward Workforce Development Board. The iCon Program operates at eight Broward County High Schools: Blanche Ely, Boyd Anderson, Deerfield Beach, Dillard, Fort Lauderdale, McArthur, Piper, and Stranahan and serves at risk juniors and seniors. Entrepreneurial training will be provided during the afterschool iCon Program for one hour per day, one day per week, for seven weeks at each of the iCon Program schools.

This agreement has been reviewed and approved as to form and legal content by the Office of the General Counsel.

There is a financial impact of \$11,000 to the District. The source of funds is the Federal Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA) Grant from Career Source Broward (\$489,819). There is no additional financial impact to the District.

Agenda items FF-10, FF-11, and FF-13 were motioned together.

No discussion was held on these items.

The Chair received input from the audience on these items.

A vote was taken on the items.

FF-11. Agreement between The School Board of Broward County, Florida and Helping Abused, Neglected, Disadvantaged Youth, Inc. (HANDY)
(Approved)

Motion was made by Mrs. Rupert, seconded by Mrs. Good and carried, to approve the Agreement between The School Board of Broward County, Florida and Helping Abused, Neglected, Disadvantaged Youth, Inc. (HANDY). The contract period is from July 1, 2015 through June 30, 2016. Dr. Osgood was absent. (8-0 vote)

Helping Abused, Neglected, Disadvantaged Youth, Inc. (HANDY) will implement the Life Skills component of the Innovative Concepts (iCon) Program funded by the Federal Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act Grant (WIOA) through the Broward Workforce Development Board. The iCon Program operates at eight Broward County High Schools Blanche Ely, Boyd Anderson, Deerfield Beach, Dillard, Fort Lauderdale, McArthur, Piper and Stranahan serving at risk juniors and seniors. Life Skills instruction will be provided during the afterschool iCon Program for one hour per day, one day per week, for fifteen weeks at each of the iCon Program schools.

This agreement has been reviewed and approved as to form and legal content by the Office of the General Counsel.

There is a financial impact of \$15,000 to the District. The source of funds is the Federal Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA) Grant from Career Source Broward (\$489,819). There is no additional financial impact to the District.

Agenda items FF-10, FF-11, and FF-13 were motioned together.

No discussion was held on these items.

June 23, 2015

Minutes of Regular Meeting
Page 90 of 102

The Chair received input from the audience on these items.

A vote was taken on the items.

**FF-12. Agreement between the School Board of Broward County, Florida
and the City of Miramar, Florida (Approved)**

Motion was made by Mrs. Good, seconded by Mrs. Rupert and carried, to approve a new agreement between the School Board of Broward County, Florida and the City of Miramar, Florida. The term of the agreement shall be for a period of three (3) years, commencing on the date it is fully executed by both parties. Dr. Osgood was absent. (8-0 vote)

The School Board of Broward County, Florida has partnered with the City of Miramar, Florida to provide Career and Technical Education high school students who are enrolled in Criminal Justice Programs, the opportunity to participate in career related learning experiences. This district wide agreement will support the instruction provided by Broward County Public Schools necessary to meet Florida Department of Education mandated student performance standards.

See Supporting Docs for continuation of Summary Explanation and Background.

This agreement has been reviewed and approved as to form and legal content by the Office of the General Counsel.

There is a positive financial impact of \$167,400 to the District over the three-year period of the agreement. These funds are being provided by the City of Miramar, through an annual donation, to operate the Criminal Justice program at Miramar High School for the duration of this agreement. There is no additional financial impact to the District.

The Chair received input from the audience on this item.

Mrs. Good thanked those from the audience that spoke and all those involved. This is a three-year agreement that will afford the school, teachers, and students the opportunity to get a program, in which there is already great interest from the students.

Mrs. Bartleman also thanked the City of Miramar and those that spoke from the audience. She was excited this program was up and running and believed this program was similar to the police academy in Dade County. She hoped this program would be used as a model and test pilot to expand to other parts of the county.

A vote was taken on the item.

**FF-13. Agreement between the School Board of Broward County, Florida
and the City of Coral Springs (Approved)**

Motion was made by Mrs. Rupert, seconded by Mrs. Good and carried, to approve a continuation agreement between the School Board of Broward County, Florida and the City of Coral Springs. This agreement shall be for a term of three (3) years, commencing on the date it is fully executed by both parties. Dr. Osgood was absent. (8-0 vote)

The School Board of Broward County, Florida has partnered with the City of Coral Springs to provide Career and Technical Education high school students who are enrolled in Health Science, as well as Law and Public Safety Education programs, the opportunity to participate in career related work experiences. This district-wide agreement will support the instruction provided by Broward County Public Schools necessary to meet Florida Department of Education mandated student performance standards.

See Supporting Docs for continuation of Summary Explanation and Background.

This agreement has been reviewed and approved as to form and legal content by the Office of the General Counsel.

The agreement with the City of Coral Springs will be executed after School Board approval.

There is a financial impact of \$64,200 to the District for participating schools that utilize the instructional piece of this agreement. The source of these funds is Coral Springs High School and Lauderhill 6-12 General Operating Budget. Taravella High School will only utilize the Police Explorer services to which there is no charge. There is no additional financial impact to the District.

Agenda items FF-10, FF-11, and FF-13 were motioned together.

No discussion was held on these items.

The Chair received input from the audience on these items.

A vote was taken on the items.

GG. OFFICE OF HUMAN RESOURCES

HH. OFFICE OF THE GENERAL COUNSEL

HH-1. Settlement Agreement between The School Board of Broward County, Florida and Pierce Goodwin Alexander & Linville (Approved)

Motion was made by Mrs. Rupert, seconded by Mrs. Good and carried, to approve the Settlement Agreement between The School Board of Broward County, Florida and Pierce Goodwin Alexander & Linville. Dr. Osgood was absent. (8-0 vote)

This Agreement is the result of efforts to resolve differences and disputes between Pierce Goodwin Alexander & Linville ("PGAL") and The School Board of Broward County, Florida (the "SBBC") arising from the design and construction improvement of the McArthur High School Project, Project No. 0241-98-01 (hereinafter "the Project").

See Supporting Docs for continuation of Summary Explanation and Background.

There is a positive financial impact to the District in the amount of \$1,225,000.

Agenda items HH-1, II-1, and II-2 were motioned together.

No discussion was held on these items.

The Chair received input from the audience on these items.

A vote was taken on the items.

I. OFFICE OF THE SUPERINTENDENT

II-1. School Resource Officer (SRO) Program Agreements - (2015-2016) (Approved)

Approve the SRO Agreements with designated municipalities for police officers to serve as School Resource Officers as listed in the Executive Summary. Dr. Osgood was absent. (8-0 vote)

The Agreements provide for police officers to serve as School Resource Officers in twenty-four (24) elementary, eight (8) middle, six (6) high schools and three (3) centers that are operated by the School Board and located in the designated municipal police jurisdictions. The School Resource Officer Program is one of the most effective, proactive safety and security programs in our schools.

See Supporting Docs for continuation of Summary Explanation and Background.

These Agreements have been reviewed and approved as to form and legal content by the Office of the General Counsel.

The financial impact of the SRO Program is \$1,859,330.40. The source of funds is the Broward District Schools Police Department budget for the 2015 - 2016 school year.

Agenda items HH-1, II-1, and II-2 were motioned together.

No discussion was held on these items.

The Chair received input from the audience on these items.

A vote was taken on the items.

II-2. Affiliation with the Florida Association of District School Superintendents for the 2015-2016 School Year (Approved)

Motion was made by Mrs. Rupert, seconded by Mrs. Good and carried, to approve membership in the Florida Association of District School Superintendents (FADSS). Dr. Osgood was absent. (8-0 vote)

The Florida Association of District School Superintendents (FADSS) assists and supports superintendents in providing leadership to ensure that every student in Florida acquires the skills, knowledge and attitude to be contributing members of our democratic society through leadership development programs focused on student achievement, building relationships with business and government leaders, and communication and networking services.

The cost of the FADSS affiliation is \$24,884. The source of funding is the Superintendent's budget.

Agenda items HH-1, II-1, and II-2 were motioned together.

No discussion was held on these items.

The Chair received input from the audience on these items.

A vote was taken on the items.

II-3. Amendment to the 2015-2016 Organizational Chart: Pages 7 & 15 (Approved Page 7, Postponed Page 15)

Motion was made by Mrs. Rupert, seconded by Mrs. Good and carried, to approve the changes to pages 7 and 15 of the 2015-2016 Organizational Chart. Dr. Osgood was absent. (8-0 vote)

On June 9, 2015, the School Board approved agenda Item II-6, The School Board of Broward County, Florida 2015-2016 Organizational Chart. The Chief Fire Official designation was a topic of discussion during the Board's deliberation of the item. The Board was advised that staff would identify the appropriate, qualified individual to designate as the District's Chief Fire Official pending further review and would address the issue in conjunction with the Board's approval of the new and revised job descriptions (see Agenda Item CC-5). It is now recommended to designate the Manager, Emergency Management, as the Chief Fire Official. The amendment to page 15 of the 2015-2016 Organizational Chart is to reflect the Chief Fire Official designation to the position title. As a result of this designation and the additional performance responsibilities, the position would be compensated within Pay Band "C."

See Supporting Docs for continuation of Summary Explanation and Background.

The estimated financial impact of this amendment is \$27,326 in salary / benefit costs. This estimate utilizes standard salaries and benefit figures to estimate a reflective financial impact, recognizing the actual financial impact associated with the Organizational Chart is a dynamic figure dependent on attrition, position sourcing, and actual compensation associated with new hires.

Agenda items II-3 and CC-5 were discussed concurrently.

The Chair received input from the audience on these items.

A vote was taken on the items.

JJ. OFFICE OF FACILITIES AND CONSTRUCTION

JJ-1. Change Order #2 Parkway Middle School Advanced Roofing, Inc. - Roof Replacement Buildings 22 and 24 Project No. - P.001617 (Approved)

Motion was made by Mrs. Rupert, seconded by Mrs. Good and carried, to approve Change Order #2, Parkway Middle School, Advanced Roofing, Inc., Roof Replacement Buildings 22 and 24, Project No. P.001617, in the amount of \$15,922, -4- days. Dr. Osgood was absent. (8-0 vote)

Change Order #2, \$15,922, -4- days
Parkway Middle School
Advanced Roofing, Inc.
Roof Replacement Buildings 22 and 24
Project No. P.001617

Refer to Exhibits 1 and 3 for detailed information.

All projects have been appropriated in the Amendment to the Adopted District Educational Facilities Plan (May 19, 2015) and in the District's Capital Budget.

Agenda items JJ-1, JJ-2, and JJ-3 were motioned together.

No discussion was held on these items.

JJ-2. Project Budget Adjustment Fort Lauderdale High School Remodeling/Renovations Project No. - P.000687 (f.k.a. 0951-27-01) (Approved)

Motion was made by Mrs. Rupert, seconded by Mrs. Good and carried, to approve the increase to budget by \$388,182 and additional funds required for Furniture Fixtures and Equipment purchases needed to finalize this project. Dr. Osgood was absent. (8-0 vote)

The current budget of \$22,683,207 is insufficient to complete the final phase of construction. Specific budget line items were exceeded, impacting the Furniture Fixtures and Equipment budget.

There will be an additional financial impact in the amount of \$388,182 that will come from the Capital Projects Reserve.

Agenda items JJ-1, JJ-2, and JJ-3 were motioned together.

No discussion was held on these items.

JJ-3. Change Order #9 Fort Lauderdale High School Kaufman Lynn Construction, Inc. - Remodeling/Renovations Project No. - P.000687 (f.k.a. 0951-27-01) (Approved)

Motion was made by Mrs. Rupert, seconded by Mrs. Good and carried, to approve Change Order #9, Fort Lauderdale High School, Kaufman Lynn Construction, Inc., Remodeling/Renovations, Project No. P.000687, in the amount of \$3,535, -0- days. Dr. Osgood was absent. (8-0 vote)

Change Order #9, \$3,535, -0- days
Fort Lauderdale High School
Kaufman Lynn Construction, Inc.
Remodeling/Renovations
Project No. P.000687

Refer to Exhibits 1 and 3 for detailed information.

All projects have been appropriated in the Amendment to the Adopted District Educational Facilities Plan (May 19, 2015) and in the District's Capital Budget.

Agenda items JJ-1, JJ-2, and JJ-3 were motioned together.

No discussion was held on these items.

**JJ-4. Approve Funding Request for Payment to Brown & Brown Architects
for Services Rendered for Various Projects (Approved)**

Motion was made by Mrs. Rupert, seconded by Mrs. Brinkworth and carried, to approve the request for funding in the amount of \$278,387 for the purpose of payment to Brown & Brown Architects for services rendered on three projects: Margate Middle School, New Kitchen/ Multipurpose Building, Project No. P.000111 (f.k.a. 0581-23-01) - Coconut Creek High School, Remodeling and Renovations, Project No. P.000305 (f.k.a. 1681-25-01) - Northeast High School, Phased Replacement, Project No. P.000231 (f.k.a. 1241-27-01). Dr. Osgood was absent. (8-0 vote)

On February 17, 2010, the Board approved the termination of the Professional Services Agreement between The School Board of Broward County, Florida, and Brown & Brown Architects on three projects, namely:

- Margate Middle School, New Kitchen/ Multipurpose Building, Project No. P.000111 (f.k.a. 0581-23-01)
- Coconut Creek High School, Remodeling and Renovations, Project No. P.000305 (f.k.a. 1681-25-01)
- Northeast High School, Phased Replacement, Project No. P. 000231 (f.k.a. 1241-27-01)

See Supporting Doc for continuation of Summary Explanation and Background.

There will be an additional financial impact in the amount of \$278,387 that will come from the Capital Projects Reserve.

Mrs. Rupert asked where these were in the process.

Mr. Messier replied Margate Middle School was part of year three (3) in 2016-2017 and there was a total of just over \$9 million scheduled for that school. Coconut Creek High School was in year two (2) in the 2015-2016 school year and has over \$5 million scheduled. Northeast High School was in year one (1), which is right now and \$15.8 million scheduled.

Mrs. Rupert questioned if the new kitchen, multi-purpose building for Margate and the modeling renovations for Coconut Creek were included. In addition, she inquired about the reuse of the plans.

Mr. Messier stated those contracts were terminated in 2010. Staff has been working aggressively to close out all the projects so a lot of baggage is not carried into the new program. In the case of Margate, the new kitchen/ multi-purpose building is not being done because cafeterias are not being done anywhere in the District. A lot of things were designed in the past but they are moving forward with what has been approved in the ADEFP.

Mr. Runcie added, there were a lot of commitments made to the communities that they were not aware had been made. Through many Board meetings and workshop it was decided what items to bring forward from the historical ADEFPs and those were merged with the SMART program (Safety, Music, Art, Athletics, Renovations, & Technology) and that is the Bible going forward. There are lots of needs and the bond program was structured to meet the most critical needs. They were not able to get to all of the interior spaces to address everything equaling approximately \$3 billion. It is his hope that they will be able to get to those things in the next phase of work. It is not lost; it is work that is captured to still be completed and is in the District's needs assessment.

Mrs. Bartleman inquired if the online status of jobs would be updated for the public to view.

Mr. Messier responded it would be updated as part of the new program management organization. They will be bringing in a new database system to manage all of the work and will be accessible to provide up-to-date and timely reporting of the projects for the Board any other stakeholders.

A vote was taken on the item.

JJ-5. Change Order #2 Western High School Cedars Electro-Mechanical, Inc. - Remodeling and Renovation, ADA, and IAQ Project No. - P.000505 (f.k.a. 2831-99-02) (Approved)

Motion was made by Mrs. Rupert, seconded by Mrs. Brinkworth and carried, to approve Change Order #2, Western High School, Cedars Electro-Mechanical, Inc., Remodeling and Renovation, ADA, and IAQ, Project No. P.000505, in the amount of \$152,569 CREDIT, -90- days. Dr. Osgood was absent. (8-0 vote)

Change Order #2, \$152,569 CREDIT,-90- days
Western High School
Cedars Electro-Mechanical, Inc.
Remodeling and Renovation, ADA, and IAQ
Project No. P.000505

Refer to Exhibits 1 and 3 for detailed information.

June 23, 2015

Minutes of Regular Meeting
Page 98 of 102

A positive financial impact of \$8,721 will be added to the Capital Projects Reserve.

Mrs. Rich Levinson inquired what the status was for this job.

Mr. Messier replied there was a challenge in the way this project was done, as well as many others. They completed the project that was designed as they were asked; however, there was a mechanical upgrade to improve the air conditioning, but the entire school was not rebalanced. The project only asked for it to be balanced at the air-handling unit and they did not have the complete scope of work. Mr. Messier stated they were in the process of completing repairs and the final test and balance to get this working right. He went to the school and personally met with the principal to get the problems resolved at the school, which will be resolved before the start of the new school year. Moving forward, they will be commissioning, which is not waiting until the end of a job to see if it works. They will verify throughout the entire project before it is completed to ensure they are doing the right scope of work.

Mr. Runcie asked Mr. Messier to explain commissioning relative to the positions that were added.

Mr. Messier said there would be a Manager commissioning and the District's owners' representatives would be responsible for being the commissioning agent. What this means is that no one is waiting for a punch list at the end to clean up. In the beginning during design, the commissioning agent will make sure everything actually works together, that through the controls specified and equipment everyone is using will be able to talk to one another, and that the existing systems in the school will work with the new systems. This process starts in design and carries through construction so when the actual punch list come through, it is just that, a punch list and the system works. Unfortunately, that was not in this project and was a major failing. Mechanical work cannot be completed with the complexity of the systems without commissioning.

Mrs. Rich Levinson thanked staff for the comprehensive explanation.

A vote was taken on the item.

JJ-6. Approve Additional Funding Request for Jacobs Project Management Co. Facilities Needs Assessment Project No. - P.001595 for Additional Services Rendered (Approved)

Motion was made by Mrs. Good, seconded by Mrs. Brinkworth and carried, to approve the request for additional funding in the amount of \$19,548 for the purpose of payment to Jacobs Project Management Co., Facilities Needs Assessment, Project No. P.001595, for additional services rendered. Dr. Osgood was absent. Mrs. Bartleman voted "no." (7-1 vote)

June 23, 2015

Minutes of Regular Meeting
Page 99 of 102

On February 11, 2014, the Board approved the Agreement for Professional Services between The School Board of Broward County, Florida, and Jacobs Project Management Co. for Facilities Needs Assessment Services. The initial scope included assessment of permanent buildings and portables, however, it was not made clear at the time that the assessment of portables was limited to a specific selection of units. Once this was realized, District Staff requested and authorized the assessment of the District's remaining portables. Additional funding was not requested at the time to cover the increased scope of work.

Approval of this additional service fee allows for final payment to Jacobs Project Management Co. for services rendered.

There will be an additional financial impact in the amount of \$19,548 that will come from the Capital Projects Reserve.

Mrs. Rupert referred to the Summary Explanation where it stated District staff requested an authorized assessment of remaining portables, which was not part of the original scope of work. She asked if it went through the Superintendent and the Board for approval.

Mr. Messier replied it did not and that was why it was being brought to the Board now.

Mrs. Rupert stated the original amount was approximately \$1.5 million that was reduced to \$1.2 million by the Board. To accomplish the work with less money it was to utilize BCPS staff to provide all field labor related to Section 5.0, Building Condition Assessment. In addition, under Article 2 of the contract it stated any work performed by consultant prior to receipt of both a fully executed written authorization to proceed and PO shall be at consultant's own risk. Under Building Assessment, it stated Jacobs would orient and guide BCPS staff to perform. Mrs. Rupert acknowledged the amount was only \$19,548 but she was confused as to how the work was started and completed.

Mr. Messier responded that he was made aware of this from the consultant company that they were authorized to proceed, he wanted to ensure it was documented. It was clearly a "not to exceed" amount that was authorized, so before he authorized to pay a consultant above that amount he needed to bring the item forward. They did perform the work as directed and he brought the item forward but it did not follow the appropriate process.

Ms. Korn followed up and said at the Board's direction, staff basically did something potentially beyond their ability.

Mr. Messier replied yes, they had the right intention where they were trying to get all the portables assessed, but did not follow the right procedure.

Ms. Korn concluded that this change order amount was to clean it up.

Mrs. Rupert asked even though this said under the compensation it was a lump sum contract, would the District still be obligated to pay this amount.

Mr. Carland replied the language that was read talked about "as authorized" and was not specific as to who that would be. The item indicated that staff directed the additional scope. He advised the Board if they decided not to proceed with the authority to pay for the scope, there would be a potential dispute. Where the language was not very clear as to who could grant that authority, they acted upon staff's authority.

Mrs. Rupert requested in the future that this would be delineated better.

Mr. Messier commented they way they are moving forward with everything, whether construction or professional services, is change orders.

A vote was taken on the item.

KK. OFFICE OF FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT

LL. OFFICE OF PORTFOLIO SERVICES

LL-1. Declaration of Ten (10) Portables Located at School Sites Depicted in Exhibit No. 1 as Surplus (Approved)

Motion was made by Mrs. Rupert, seconded by Mrs. Good and carried, to approve the declaration of ten (10) portables located at school sites depicted in Exhibit No. 1 as surplus with the intent to dispose of the portables (which includes demolition). Dr. Osgood was absent. (8-0 vote)

Section 1013.28 (2) and 274.05, Florida Statutes, directs school districts to dispose of tangible property that is obsolete, or the continued use of which is uneconomical, inefficient, or which serves no useful function. The ten (10) portables depicted in Exhibit No. 1 have been declared unsatisfactory due to their deteriorated physical condition, and therefore carry zero student stations. However, before the portables can be demolished, they must be declared surplus to comply with the provisions of Sections 1013.28 (2) and 274.05, Florida Statutes.

The funds to demolish the ten (10) portables will be requested as a part of the portable demolition cost in the District Educational Facilities Plan (DEFP), Fiscal Year 2015/2016.

Agenda items LL-1 and LL-2 were motioned together.

No discussion was held on these items.

LL-2. Student Enrichment in the Arts (SEAS)

(Approved)

Motion was made by Mrs. Rupert, seconded by Mrs. Good and carried, to approve the 2015-2016 SEAS program at schools and at the Broward Center for the Performing Arts. Dr. Osgood was absent. (8-0 vote)

Since 1991, The School Board of Broward County, Florida in partnership with the Broward Center for the Performing Arts, has presented the national award-winning Student Enrichment in the Arts (SEAS) program. The SEAS program continues to offer a unique style of learning by integrating theatrical performances in dance, music, and drama into the student's education. SEAS brings to life storybooks and novels on stage. Each and every performance includes a study guide that links the performance to Florida New Generation Sunshine State Standards. Approximately 193 performances benefiting 136,782 students will take place in theaters and at schools during the 2015-2016 school year.

See Supporting Docs for continuation of Summary Explanation and Background.

The total financial impact of this item is \$384,000. The source of funds is the Student Enrichment Trust Fund. There is no financial impact to the District's general fund.

Agenda items LL-1 and LL-2 were motioned together.

No discussion was held on these items.

Adjournment This meeting was adjourned at 8:17 p.m.

dvn