

Approved in Open Board Meeting June 21, 2016

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

April 19, 2016
Tuesday, 10:15 a.m.

MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING

The School Board of Broward County, Florida, met in regular session at 10:21 a.m., Tuesday, April 19, 2016, in the Board Room of the Kathleen C. Wright Administrative Center, 600 Southeast Third Avenue, Fort Lauderdale, Florida. Present were: School Board Members, Dr. Rosalind Osgood, Chair; Abby M. Freedman, Vice Chair; Robin Bartleman; Heather Brinkworth; Patricia Good; Donna P. Korn; Laurie Rich Levinson; Ann Murray; Nora Rupert; Robert W. Runcie, Superintendent of Schools; and Barbara J. Myrick, Esq.

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

Minutes for Approval Motion was made by Mrs. Good, seconded by Ms. Korn and carried, to approve the official minutes for the following Board Meetings: Mrs. Bartleman was absent for the vote. (8-0 vote)

March 1, 2016 - Regular School Board Meeting (amended)
March 9, 2016 - Special Second Public Hearing - Boundaries (amended)
April 5, 2016 - Special - Expulsions

Added/Changed Items The Superintendent requested that the Board permit the following changes to the agenda:

- **Minutes** - Added: March 9, 2016 - Second Public Hearing - Boundaries
- **Speakers** - Withdrawn: Heidi Feuerman
- **Consent Items** - Revised: A-3
- **Open Items** - Revised: CC-2; Revised/Memo to Vote Down: LL-5; Added: LL-6

The Chair approved the changes and announced the changes to the Agenda proposed by the Superintendent were accepted by the Chair after being determined that good cause had been established for said changes.

Close Agenda Upon motion by Mrs. Rupert, seconded by Ms. Korn and carried, the Agenda was approved and declared closed. Mrs. Bartleman was absent for the vote. (8-0 vote)

Special Presentations

- Resolution in Support of April as Military Child Month – April 2016 (Resolution #16-64)
- Recognition in Support of the Harvest Feast
- Proclamation in Recognition of Sexual Assault Awareness and Child Abuse Prevention

These special presentations may be viewed in their entirety at:

<http://www.browardschools.com/School-Board/Special-Presentations>

Reports The following report was presented:

- Employee Unions/Groups - Sharon Glickman, President, Broward Teachers Union (BTU)

This report may be viewed in its entirety at:

<https://becon223.eduvision.tv/Default.aspx?q=d0F7qPKK1cfmtjfULqo9AQ%3d%3d>

(Click on School Board Meeting 4-19-16.)

Superintendent

The Superintendent stated he would add an item to next week's workshop to provide a brief update to the School Board and the public in regards to the work taking place in the District Police department.

Speakers

Eugene Steele

Wayne Vereen

Trudy Jermanovich

Terry Lopez-Preuss

Rosemarie Jensen

Cathi Rush

Irene Brenner

Youssef Wardani

Pamela Damelio

David Hofman

Lynda Olds

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. Good, seconded by Mrs. Rupert and carried, to approve the Consent Agenda for the remaining items (**identified by ***). (9-0 vote)

CONSENT ITEMS

A. RESOLUTION

A-1. Resolution in Support of "A Safe Haven for Newborns" (Adopted)

Motion was made by Ms. Korn, seconded by Mrs. Good and carried, to adopt Resolution #16-99, in Support of "A Safe Haven for Newborns." (9-0 vote)

Mrs. Rupert thanked her colleague and the officials that were present for bringing this item forward.

This special presentation may be viewed in its entirety at:
<http://www.browardschools.com/School-Board/Special-Presentations>

A vote was taken on this item.

A-2. Resolution in support of Teacher Appreciation Week - May 2, 2016 - May 6, 2016, and National Teacher's Day - May 3, 2016 (Adopted)

Motion was made by Mrs. Bartleman, seconded by Mrs. Rupert and carried, to adopt Resolution 16-100 in support of Teacher Appreciation Week - May 2, 2016 - May 6, 2016, and National Teacher's Day - May 3, 2016. (9-0 vote)

Board Members thanked teachers for their hard work and all they do for the students of Broward County.

A vote was taken on this item.

A-3. Revised Resolution 15-106 of the Broward County School Board Regarding The Bond Oversight Committee (Approved as Amended)

Motion was made by Mrs. Rupert, seconded by Ms. Korn and carried, to approve the revised Resolution 15-106 of the Broward County School Board regarding the Bond Oversight Committee. **This motion was superseded by Motions to Amend (page 4).** Mrs. Freedman and Mrs. Rich Levinson were absent for the vote. (7-0 vote)

Mrs. Rupert inquired if waiving the term limits was consistent with the philosophy of the other advisory oversight boards. She did not see how the Committee members were to be vetted and wanted to know if TaxWatch would be part of that vetting.

Omar Shim, Director, Capital Budget, responded the additional three members would have the expertise and the Committee would select them.

Jeffrey Moquin, Chief of Staff, added the other terms and conditions of the resolution would still be applicable to that in terms of the code of ethics and those sort of things.

Ms. Myrick referred to Section 2 on page 1, the Committee would make sure the three additional people will meet the criteria.

Mrs. Rupert asked if that would be the Committee's responsibility or that of TaxWatch.

Mr. Moquin replied TaxWatch was there to support and perform many of the administrative functions for them, so he did not see it being a problem for TaxWatch handling.

Mrs. Good remembered discussions about this Committee having term limits originally and there were reasons for the specified time periods. She did not recall it being left open-ended so there would be no limitation whatsoever.

Benjamin Leong, Chief Financial Officer, stated the issue was the Board contemplated this Committee was sunset because the program would only last 7-8 years. He said the Board could make a change if it so desired.

Mrs. Good referred to page 11, paragraph 13, regarding a Committee Member notifying General Counsel of a conflict of interest. She looked at both statutes that allow the Board to get involved in a conflict of interest; however, she did not want the Board to be put in that situation. If there was a conflict of interest there should be language that the Committee member will do whatever it has to do. She also suggest removing language on page 10, paragraph 10, that states the person would remove himself or herself "if requested by the Chairperson or by a majority vote" of the Committee.

Ms. Myrick gave her opinion to the suggested language.

Motion to Amend (Carried)

Motion was made by Mrs. Good, seconded by Mrs. Rupert and carried to amend language in Resolution 15-106, page 10, paragraph 10 of Section 9 to read: In the event of a potential conflict of interest, members will disclose the known conflict and, until such time that a determination is made by the Office of the General Counsel and/or the Florida Commission on Ethics, the committee member will remove him or herself from all discussion and voting on the matter in question; Mrs. Freedman and Mrs. Rich Levinson were absent for the vote. (7-0 vote)

A vote was taken on the Motion to Amend.

Second Motion to Amend (Carried)

Motion was made by Mrs. Good, seconded by Mrs. Rupert and carried, to amend Resolution 15-106, page 11, paragraph 13 of Section 9 to read: A Committee member shall promptly notify the Office of the General Counsel of a potential conflict of interest or voting conflict. If appropriate, an advisory opinion may be requested on behalf of the Committee Member from the Florida Commission on Ethics. If a determination is made by the Office of the General Counsel and/or the Commission on Ethics that a conflict exists, the Committee Member will be required to resign from the Committee. Mrs. Freedman and Mrs. Rich Levinson were absent for the vote. (7-0 vote)

A vote was taken on the Second Motion to Amend.

A vote was taken on this item as amended.

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.

***E-2. First Amendment to Agreement 16-004V - Third-Party Administrator for Tax-Sheltered Annuities for School Board Employees (Approved)**

Approved the First Amendment to Agreement for the above contract. Contract Term: July 1, 2015 through December 31, 2018, 3 Years; User Department: Benefits and Employment Services; Awarded Vendor(s): TSA Consulting Group, Inc.; M/WBE Vendor(s): None.

E-3. Recommendation to Approve Extension of Bid - 11-044V - School Uniforms (Approved)

Motion was made by Ms. Korn, seconded by Mrs. Rupert and carried, to approve the extension of the above contract. Contract Term: June 21, 2011 through April 30, 2016, 4 Years, 10 Months; User Department: Schools; Awarded Vendor(s): Carlyn International Corporation; Eurena's Fashions, Inc.; In Unison School Apparel, LLC; and Uniform Square; M/WBE Vendor(s): None. Mrs. Bartleman and Mrs. Freedman voted no. (7-2 vote)

Mrs. Rupert commented with the timing of letters being sent out end of February/early March to vendors, so why could staff not have gone out to bid then in a timely manner in January/February. This would have left plenty of time for vendors in place for school uniform purchases.

Maurice Woods, Chief Strategy & Operations Officer, replied they allocated their time to items that were of a higher priority.

Mrs. Good stated the extension of the contract would be taken to the beginning of the school year and could create potential problems. She asked staff if they contemplated the possibility of a change in vendors when they go out for bid.

Mr. Woods responded that the contract was based on requirements and specifications so if vendors did change, parents would still be able to purchase those uniforms that meet the specifications and requirements. As far as extending the timeframe, the contract only allows for either a renewal or 180-day extension and they would want to rebid rather than come back to the Board for another full renewal.

Mrs. Good mentioned some of the vendors have embroidery on the shirts and she wanted to be sure they would be able to meet the demand in the short time span.

Mr. Woods indicated none of the vendors said they would have any problem in meeting the demand for the 180 days.

Mrs. Bartleman was concerned that the schools were mandating parents to use these vendors' uniforms and felt parents should be able to shop at places such as, Walmart or Target for their uniforms.

Mr. Woods replied they viewed this as a low-cost alternative and tried to use their buying power to obtain prices that were attractive to parents who chose to go through this vehicle but, by no means, did they mandate or dictate that parents use it. He said parents could go to Walmart and many do. This was just another way provided for parents, PTAs, and schools to take advantage of this vehicle.

Mrs. Bartleman requested staff to verify that schools were not mandating parents to use these uniforms with emblems. In addition, she would like the pricing of the uniforms and verification that students could buy the emblems and allow them to be put on by parents.

Ms. Murray concurred with her colleague and had received complaints from parents that they were told they had to buy shirts from a specific supplier. Uniforms were voted in by parents and have been a convenience for many parents. There is something available for everyone's needs.

Mrs. Good commented that she did not think this forced parents to go anywhere but rather allowed another avenue for those parents that did want the logos. She felt it was better to give parents more choices. She said the message needs to be communicated to the schools so they know the choices parents have as well.

Mrs. Bartleman stated the intent and what was actually happening at the schools were two different things.

Dr. Osgood liked that parents were being given the opportunity to have the choices.

A vote was taken on this item.

E-4. Recommendation to Reject all Bids - 16-094T - Biomedical Waste Removal (Approved)

Motion was made by Ms. Korn, seconded by Mrs. Rupert and carried, to approve the recommendation to reject all bids for the above contract. Mrs. Rich Levinson and Ms. Murray were absent for the vote. (7-0 vote)

Mrs. Good verified they were supposed to reject all the bids and staff was going to go out again to rebid.

Mr. Woods replied that was correct. He said this item was a very low spend item so he did not know when they would go out to rebid. He stated that given the spend was so low, it might make sense to bring it back as a post-memo or look to see if there was another vehicle they could use.

Mrs. Good asked how long could services be used when based on quotes.

Mr. Woods responded quotes were based on a dollar threshold, which was up to \$50,000 for this item, so the quote could stay open as long as there was a balance on that quote.

Mrs. Good asked if the Board could receive follow-up since it was so small and did not require a bid through a quote system.

Ms. Korn said it stated on the back of the Tabulation sheet that it was a term contract. She asked if that was why the bids were being rejected.

Mr. Woods replied that was correct.

Ms. Korn stated there currently are companies that do this, so would the services just continue.

Mary Coker, Director, Procurement & Warehousing Services, responded there were companies that were doing this for the District. By rejecting all bids, the new bid had an additional requirement and license that was required by Risk Management and they later came to find out it was not a requirement and that was why they were rejecting all bids. They will continue to use the services they are currently using and use the three-quote bid system until they go back out to bid.

Ms. Korn questioned if they had been using the three-quote bid system and did they have to terminate anything when they went out for this bid.

Ms. Coker replied they have been using the three-quote bid system and said no, they did not have to terminate anything when they went out for this bid. They will be rebidding this as soon as the Board approves it.

A vote was taken on this item.

**E-5. Recommendation to Reject All Bids - 16-096T - Supply and Install Sod
(SEE ITEM EE-6) (Approved)**

Motion was made by Mrs. Rupert, seconded by Ms. Korn and carried, to approve the recommendation to reject all bids for the above contract. Mrs. Bartleman and Mrs. Freedman were absent for the vote. (7-0 vote)

Agenda Item E-5 and EE-6 were moved and discussed concurrently.

Mrs. Rupert asked if this was a re-bid and referred to E-5, the second paragraph on page 2 of the Recommendation to Reject All Bids.

Mr. Woods replied yes. The vendors tried to take a significant price increase for the new bid. There was a current bid in place and after discussion with the departments involved, they felt it was more prudent for the District to stay with the lower current bid, to reject the bid with price increases, and spend the next 6-9 months revisiting how to restructure this bid to get more participation in the future.

Mrs. Rupert suggested next time re-phrasing it to make it clearer. She asked why Mullings Engineering Services was rejected.

Mary Coker, Director, Procurement & Warehousing Services, responded the license Mullings provided was not valid at the time of request and became effective after the bid response and therefore disqualified them.

Mrs. Rupert referred back to June 18, 2015, item EE-8, which explained in the Executive Summary the need for an additional spend authority of \$400,000, regarding 1) the 7 buildings for demolition and site restoration at Blanche Ely High; 2) demolition of Building No. 12 and the playground at Pompano Beach High; and 3) demolition of 126 portables and site restoration District-wide.

Mr. Bays stated the first two were completed. He said they were currently doing the portable now. The portables at Stranahan High were completed and they finished 35 at Stoneman Douglas High. They were working on others, as well as other ball field restorations in the interim. He said they spent virtually every dollar of the \$140,000 that they received.

Mrs. Rupert would like to see a reconciliation of what was actually done with the money previously requested because staff was now coming and asking for more spend authority for listed projects.

Mr. Woods said they would provide a reconciliation on projects completed to date.

Mrs. Rupert asked if the completion of the four football fields for Coconut Creek, Pompano Beach, McArthur, and Miramar High Schools had been completed.

Mr. Bays could not answer at this time but did not believe it was tied with the \$140,000 spend authority. It was actually generated for the \$400,000.

Mrs. Rupert pointed out that it was not delineated in the notes but in the future it would be helpful when staff returns the following year to show that X amount of dollars went to the specified projects allocated to those dollars. For this request, staff would first have to know if those projects were completed and then have them assimilated in the new ask.

Ms. Coker replied moving forward she would ensure items that had a history were verified as to what was included in the funds and would include it in the Executive Summary.

Mrs. Rupert referenced page 1 of the Cost Analysis Report on EE-6, mentioning the four high schools selected for the football fields. She requested staff to check to see which, if any, of these schools had the fields completed.

Mr. Woods summarized what needed to be done pertaining to these schools. He said they were to provide a reconciliation of the \$145,000 then take the list of what they did do vs. what was in the June 15th category and projects on that list that were not completed should be part of this list. If any of the four high schools at the top of the Cost Analysis Report were on the previous list, they would come back and state they were not completed from that previous list.

Mr. Bays added that there were an additional 15 high schools that needed maintenance repairs for their football fields as well.

Mrs. Rupert asked that staff delineate those 15 schools; whether the four high schools were completed from last year to this year, if they were being added to this year, or if they were additional other ones. In other words, the amount asked for was reduced, the scope was X but was reduced because of the lesser amount received, and now there was a different list, but it did not indicate what was completed from the first list in 2015 and whether anything needed to be added to this list. In addition, she referred to the surveys, in which some had some negative remarks, and she requested that the Minority/Women Business Enterprise (M/WBE) company be coached and given every opportunity to excel. At this time, she did not have enough financial information to support this item.

Dr. Osgood stated the District wanted to create opportunities for M/WBEs but should not mean it needed to compromise the standards and expectations of the service. As a Board Member, she wanted to go on record that she expects these firms to deliver and provide good customer service and they should not get a pass simply because they are a W/MBE-owned business.

Mrs. Good concurred with her colleague on the financial information and wanted to know when staff planned to re-bid this item.

Ms. Coker replied the current contract would end in December 2016 and they would re-bid 120 prior to that date.

Mrs. Good did not have a comfort level with how the dollars were spent and, while she appreciated what was done to save the District dollars, she also needed more information on the additional dollars being requested.

Mrs. Rich Levinson welcomed Ms. Coker and thanked her for her clear, concise answers, as well as for going out to re-bid.

Ms. Murray stated there were only so many sod farms left and the supply was very limited. As she talked with people who ran sod by the truckloads and dealt with price differences, they told her it changed day-to-day depending on the supply and demand. She requested information to be provided from the bids on where the sod farms were located and what other options the District would have if it went north of Okeechobee, Florida for a bid. She thanked staff for their efforts.

Ms. Korn believed staff did what they were supposed to and thought they would have ample time to re-bid within the next two months and have something by November or early December.

Mrs. Brinkworth inquired if the additional spend authority would cover all the projects that were slated to be completed by the end of the school year. She did not want a football program to not be able to start in August because enough spend authority was not provided.

Mr. Bays replied not all the football fields would be completed. The amount on the Cost Analysis Report of \$335,346 would pay to complete everything listed on that sheet.

Mrs. Brinkworth asked what happened to the schools on the list from the last spend authority request.

Mr. Woods responded those would be reflected in the reconciliation that he was going to provide to the Board, which would include any projects that were not previously completed and would be rolled into this spend authority.

Mrs. Good wanted to support this item but wanted to table it until later in the meeting so staff could provide more information.

Mr. Runcie agreed.

Ms. Murray was concerned that if the item was postponed the work would be delayed and she had four high schools, Deerfield, Hollywood Hills, Northeast, and Stranahan, that needed fields refurbished.

Mr. Bays replied there could be an impact on Stranahan High unless there was another \$33,000 left on the current spend authority because it was thoroughly in the process of completion. He would have to check on her other three (3) schools because he did not know how far along they were in the process.

Ms. Murray asked staff if this item was tabled, would staff be able to come back later in the meeting and provide the requested information.

Mr. Woods answered yes.

Mr. Bays clarified he was just notified that Stranahan was okay and would not need the additional spend authority towards the purchase order to complete the field because they have a valid purchase order that was already open to use.

Mrs. Bartleman verified that Stranahan would be complete regardless of what happened with this agenda item.

Mr. Bays replied yes.

Motion to Table (Carried)

Motion was made by Ms. Murray, seconded by Mrs. Rich Levinson and carried, to table Items E-5 and EE-6 until later in the meeting to allow staff to gather the requested information for the Board. (9-0 vote)

A vote was taken on the Motion to Table.

Following Agenda Item I-2, Agenda Items E-5 and EE-6 were brought back to the floor by motion made by Mrs. Rupert, seconded by Mrs. Good and acclamation of the Board.

Mr. Woods requested the items be separated so that Item E-5 could be voted on and Item EE-6 could be postponed to the next Board meeting in order to allow staff to gather the requested information and provide an analysis for the Board.

Motion to Separate (Carried)

Motion was made by Mrs. Good, seconded by Mrs. Rupert and carried to separate Agenda Items E-5 and EE-6. Mrs. Bartleman and Mrs. Freedman were absent for the vote. (7-0 vote)

A vote was taken on the Motion to Separate.

Motion was made by Ms. Korn, seconded by Mrs. Good and carried by acclamation of the Board to bring Item E-5 to the table for discussion.

Ms. Korn verified by passing this item to reject all bids it would allow the District to continue to work with the one in place now.

Mr. Woods replied yes, it had the more favorable pricing.

A vote was taken on the Item E-5.

F. OFFICE OF ACADEMICS

G. OFFICE OF HUMAN RESOURCES

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

Approved the personnel recommendations for the 2015-2016 appointments and leaves as listed in the attached Executive Summary and 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.

G-2. Personnel Recommendations for Instructional Separation of Employment or Discipline for the 2015-2016 School Year (Approved)

Motion was made by Mrs. Good, seconded by Mrs. Rupert and carried, to approve 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. (9-0 vote)

Mrs. Bartleman inquired why there were so many resignations at the end of the year.

Susan Rockelman, Director, Talent Acquisition & Operations, replied some of the resignations were for now but the majority of them were for the future. They had an early incentive window to allow employees to submit their resignations early if they were planning on leaving.

Mr. Runcie added that they were working now to fill those vacancies. In the past, they would receive the resignations in the summer and would still be trying to fill the positions at the beginning of the school year. This now allows staff to be proactive with earlier recruiting and staffing taking place.

Mrs. Bartleman stated it was her understanding that new hires' medical insurance did not kick in until November.

Craig Nichols, Chief Human Resources & Equity Officer, responded that was correct.

Mrs. Bartleman wanted to bring to the Board's attention that Palm Beach and Dade Counties do not have any delays for their teachers' medical insurance and if she were a teacher she would work with the county that was offering medical insurance right away. She said it was something that this District should consider and did not understand why this procedure was in place when the District was competing against two other counties in the tri-county.

Mr. Nichols stated he did not know the history as to why the procedure was in place but would research it and provide the Board with an answer. A 90-day or typical wait period for new employees is common with many organizations but they will research the information.

Mrs. Bartleman explained it may be common but the District wants to recruit the teachers and if the counties to the north and south of Broward County can do it, this District should be able to as well. She added that at the end of the year the other counties also picked up the teachers' insurance over the summer and wanted to know what happened to teachers in this District.

Mrs. Rockelman responded their insurance ends the month their employment is terminated with the District, so if a teacher's last day was June 2nd, his/her insurance would end June 30th.

Mrs. Bartleman said for annual contract teachers, their employment ends in June and they are picked up in the fall, but there is a gap in insurance coverage during in between. Those are incentives that are important to teachers and are what will bring them to this county. She believed it was something that needed more discussion.

Mrs. Good requested the Superintendent provide follow-up.

Mr. Runcie stated he would meet with staff to determine what was currently being done. In addition, they would reach out to other districts in the state and compare where this District was with them and a memorandum would be sent to the Board. He said depending on what they find, they would schedule a workshop in the near future.

Dildra Martin-Ogburn, Director, Benefits & Employment Services, responded in regards to the waiting period, a change was made in January 2014 in the plan design from a 30-day waiting period up to a 90-day waiting period that came from a recommendation by the Insurance Committee. She said some employees would meet the 90-day threshold and some would fall under that mark. Under Healthcare Reform they cannot exceed 90 days, so if there was an employee that exceeded the 90 days, they would have to go back to the month before, so there may be employees that only wait 70 or 75 days. It depends on when the employee starts and how it is counted forward, so not every employee may wait 90 days. Dr. Ogburn was not prepared to answer what other counties were doing at this time but would find out for the Board.

Mrs. Rockelman referenced the insurance gap during the summer months and said they were in the middle of budget conferences and would be aware of schools that may have to release their probationary teachers. She said they start working with those teachers and try to secure them a job at another school so there is not a lapse in their coverage. If they get picked up prior to the June 30th date they would not have a lapse in their coverage. If they do not get picked up, they would not be reappointed for the following year.

Mrs. Bartleman requested the number of lapses in coverage because there was a gap. She was aware staff was doing something different with the budget this year and was hoping that would close the gap. Also, if the Insurance Committee made a decision at that point in time to save dollars, it may have been prudent to do so; however, now the District was competing to hire teachers with hundreds of open positions and it needed to be more competitive. When the pay is approximately the same, it will be the insurance coverage and other benefits that will be looked at to determine where the better job is located. These need to be re-evaluated.

Dr. Ogburn replied they would take that into consideration. She reminded the Board one of the perks for working for the District was employees without dependents had their medical insurance covered at 100%, whereas, the counties to the north and south pay a portion.

Mrs. Freedman asked who sat on the Insurance Committee.

Dr. Ogburn named the following: BTU, Technical Support Professional (TSP) Unit, Federation of Public Employees (FOPE), Confidential Office Personnel Association (COPA), Educational Support & Management Association of Broward, Inc. (ESMAB), Current Teacher of the Year, Chief Human Resources & Equity Officer, and a representative from Worker's Compensation.

Mrs. Freedman stated that allowed the public the opportunity to discuss the issues with the various groups.

Mr. Nichols added that they would make a comparison analysis with all the information the Board was looking for and provide an explanation on the governance of the plans.

Dr. Osgood asked staff to include the numbers and to ensure the comparison is apples to apples, such as dependents versus dependents, when comparing with the counties to the north and south of this District. Sometimes age can be a factor that changes the rate for the cost of insurance as well, so she asked staff when they prepare the comparison that it is a comprehensive one.

Mrs. Rupert inquired if the change in design plan in 2014 was the same time annual teachers did not receive insurance over the summer if they were non-renewed.

Dr. Ogburn replied their benefits would end on June 30th if their term ended and they were not renewed.

Mrs. Rupert requested that staff also include the number of teachers who were going without insurance over the summer that were non-renewed compared today with 2014.

Mrs. Rockelman said the annual contract had been around for several years. She was aware that benefits ended in the month employment terminated for at least the past five years.

Mrs. Rupert reiterated she was trying to figure out if the numbers increased over the past several years, if they stayed steady, or they decreased and would like that information provided.

A vote was taken on this item.

G-3. Personnel Recommendations for Non-Instructional Appointments and Leaves for the 2015-2016 School Year (Approved)

Motion was made by Ms. Korn, seconded by Mrs. Good and carried, to approve the personnel recommendations for appointments and reassignments as listed on the attached Executive Summary, respective lists and individual appointments for Non-Instructional Employees. 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. (9-0 vote)

No discussion was held on this item.

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

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

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.

***G-5. Supplemental Pay Positions 16 (Approved)**

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

H. OFFICE OF THE GENERAL COUNSEL

I. OFFICE OF THE SUPERINTENDENT

I-1. Broward County School Board vs. Sherry Abram (Adopted)

Motion was made by Mrs. Rupert, seconded by Ms. Korn and carried, to adopt the Recommended Order rendered on January 27, 2016, by Cathy M. Sellers, Administrative Law Judge, in the matter of Broward County School Board vs. Sherry Abram, Case No. 15-3546, before the State of Florida Division of Administrative Hearings and enter the proposed Final Order. (9-0 vote)

Mrs. Rich Levinson questioned the timeline. The Board approved a 3-day suspension on 2/5/13, the employee requested a Division of Administrative Hearing (DOAH) on 4/15/13, and the DOAH was held 9/24/15, which was 2½ years later.

Tria Lawton-Russell, Administrative Counsel, replied the reason for the delay was because hearings were not held during the summer because staff was off contract. In addition, during the pendency of this case, the employee picked up two additional disciplinary cases and a criminal case, which contributed to the delay of this case. The docket indicates in December 2014 the case was closed. At that point, it was up to the employee to request another hearing. She did not do so until June of last year (2015).

Mrs. Rich Levinson asked where the employee had been for the past 3½ years.

Ms. Russell stated during the pendency of some of the cases and because of the allegations, the employee was reassigned, but she did not have further information.

Nicole Mancini, Director, Head Start/VPK, replied the employee was placed in another grade level and was no longer in a Head Start class at this time. To her understanding, the employee remained at the same elementary school location.

Mrs. Rich Levinson asked if the employee was being paid during this time.

Ms. Russell responded with the exception of the employee's 3-day suspension, while the allegations were pending (since they were just allegations), she was being paid.

Mrs. Rich Levinson wanted to know where the employee was relocated to during this time due to the serious, albeit, allegations. She also did not understand why a 3-day suspension had taken 3½ years.

Mr. Runcie stated he would see that she received follow-up on the details to where the employee was during that time.

Ms. Russell added that the School Police typically handle the reassignments.

Mrs. Rich Levinson commented when items with a timeline like this come to the Board, there needs to be additional information as to why this happened, where the employee was relocated, was the employee interacting with students, and what was the safety of the other students.

Ms. Russell said that information would be provided in the future. In addition, in cases where there are child abuse allegations, the employee is reassigned without student contact.

Mrs. Rich Levinson voiced her concern in the amount of cases being put forth and not having the outcomes expected.

Ms. Myrick added that often an employee puts off a DOAH case when they have criminal cases involved because they do not want anything to come out in the DOAH case that would affect their criminal case.

Mr. Runcie stated many times a judge overturns the conclusion of discipline of a case but not the findings.

Mrs. Rich Levinson requested a recap of cases from the past couple of years and the outcomes.

Mrs. Rupert supported her colleague and in addition, asked for the recommendations of the cases and what were the final results. She also requested that Policy 4.9 be brought to a workshop.

Mrs. Rich Levinson said she was fine with the policy, the concern was with the implementation.

Mrs. Bartleman agreed and felt it was not being followed.

Ms. Myrick stated there was a question with the investigations and they have been trying to reorganize and speed up that process.

Mrs. Bartleman asked the Superintendent to provide a thorough update on Policy 4.9 at the workshop next week.

A vote was taken on this item.

I-2. Amendment to the 2015-2016 Organizational Chart - Information & Technology. Reclassification of one Basis Administrator to Systems Analyst (Approved)

Motion was made by Mrs. Rupert, seconded by Ms. Korn and carried, to amend the 2015-16 Organizational Chart - Information & Technology. This amendment contains reclassification of one Basis Administrator to a Systems Analyst in the Technical Support Services Unit. Approval is also requested to advertise for the new vacant Systems Analyst position. Mrs. Bartleman and Mrs. Freedman were absent for the vote (7-0 vote)

No discussion was held on this item.

A vote was taken on this item.

J. OFFICE OF FACILITIES & CONSTRUCTION

J-1. RFQ 16-145C Professional Design Services for Quiet Waters Elementary School (Approved)

Motion was made by Ms. Korn, seconded by Mrs. Rupert and carried, to approve Authorization to Advertise RFQ 16-145C, Professional Design Services for Quiet Waters Elementary School; Approve the RFQ Form; and Authorize the Professional Services Agreement (PSA) Form. Mrs. Bartleman, Mrs. Freedman, and Mrs. Good were absent for the vote. (6-0 vote)

Agenda Items J-1 and J-2 were moved and discussed concurrently.

Mrs. Rupert referred to both and stated when it came to the Financial Impact on each, it said the funds allocated for the detailed scope of work included the specific figure and soft costs. She wanted to know what amounts were the soft costs, what were the soft costs, and what was the percentage that was built into the price.

Leo Bobadilla, Chief Facilities Officer, replied it included the 3% and all other soft costs, which includes the cost for design, construction, management, contingencies, testing, permitting fees, and anything associated with the project to deliver the project.

Mrs. Rupert remarked the 3% was for Jacobs' needs assessment being built into their process but there was a recent workshop where 5% was discussed and she questioned if the 3% would be enough. In addition, the Financial Impact stated financial obligations would take place at a future Board meeting when approval was requested to award Professional Design Services, and she asked if that meant the price would change.

Mr. Bobadilla responded they would engage a design firm and share the scope that was approved for the project with them. That firm will then take that scope and design to it. The actual price of that work will not be known until they take those documents and put them out for bid. Once they know the true costs from the bid, they will bring it back to the Board.

Mrs. Rupert asked Adkins if they were comfortable with the 3% figure.

David Carter, Senior Vice President, Adkins North America, Inc., replied they were currently using the Adopted District Educational Facilities Plan (ADEFP) budgets and scope in all the design documents. As the designers come to their submittals, they will be doing estimates on those submittals and would be able to provide some earlier indications of what the true cost of the projects would be.

Mrs. Rupert wanted her concerns to be known that there may not be enough discretionary room with the 3% figure for all the work that has to be completed at Coconut Creek High.

Mr. Bobadilla said in the workshop that will follow this meeting, part of the conversation includes making sure they maintain a program reserve for the exact reason she mentioned.

Mrs. Brinkworth requested staff to provide the Board a review of the costs for the Heating, Ventilation, and Air Conditioning (HVAC) and roofs due the reported discrepancies. She told staff it would be prudent for them to share any change in costs with the Board as soon as they know it, rather than waiting until the design is finished and Adkins has done their full review.

Ms. Korn asked when the District steps in to see if there is any value engineering of the plans.

Mr. Bobadilla responded before the value engineering there would need to be a scope verification. The value engineering is to ensure they are delivering on what they intended to and will happen at all stages.

Ms. Murray referred Item J-2, on the Executive Summary it indicated the scope include \$4.9 million and on Exhibit 2, on the Safety, Music & Art, Athletics, Renovation & Technology (SMART) Program it indicated the cost was \$6.2 million. She was concerned the money fell short of the SMART Program and was now adding projects not on the SMART Program.

Ms. Murray felt it needed to be clearer so the public could understand what was transpiring. Staff needs to show realistic figures with clear explanations of how the money is being adjusted or if it is being re-categorized. If the technology is being placed in another column, it needs to state that somewhere.

Mr. Bobadilla said they would work to be clearer with the information. He stated the scope in the ADEFP for Coconut Creek had not changed. The elements not marked with an asterisk did not mean the projects were not being done, it just meant they were being picked up somewhere else or separate projects, which was the point made to make it clearer.

Ms. Murray inquired who was paying for the water pump.

Robert Corbin, Program Director, Heery International, replied the City thought the size of the water main was 8" and through further flow testing results determined it was not that size. Over the past few years the City had tried to identify funds to allow a change. That has not been funded successfully to date. To move the project forward would require a booster pump, which was not part of the original scope and would come with a cost. He said they were investigating the design requirements associated with that booster pump to better understand the cost implications with adding that booster pump for the fire hydrant.

Ms. Murray stated depending what side of the line that pump was on is who would be responsible for paying for it. If there is a partnership involved with the project, the costs should be split. She said the Board should have a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) or something so they would know who was responsible for the costs.

A vote was taken on these items.

J-2. RFQ 16-146C Professional Design Services for Coconut Creek Senior High School (Approved)

Motion was made by Ms. Korn, seconded by Mrs. Rupert and carried, to approve Authorization to Advertise RFQ 16-146C, Professional Design Services for Coconut Creek Senior High School; Approve the RFQ Form; and Authorize the Professional Services Agreement (PSA) Form. Mrs. Bartleman, Mrs. Freedman, and Mrs. Good were absent for the vote. (6-0 vote)

Agenda Items J-1 and J-2 were moved and discussed concurrently.

A vote was taken on these items.

K. OFFICE OF FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT

***K-1. General Fund Amendment as of January 31, 2016 (Approved)**

Approved the attached General Fund Amendment as of January 31, 2016.

K-2. Special Revenue (Grants) Amendment as of January 31, 2016 (Approved)

Motion was made by Mrs. Rupert, seconded by Mrs. Brinkworth and carried, to approve the attached Special Revenue (Grants) Amendment as of January 31, 2016.

Ms. Korn inquired when the additional dollars were received, what were the funds based on.

Oleg Gorokhovskiy, Director, Budget, said they were all earmarked for middle and high schools, as well as the Post-secondary technical schools. He did not know specifically what percentage were going where but said he would have to follow-up with the Grants or Career, Technical, Adult, and Community Education (CTACE) departments for that information. Mr. Gorokhovskiy stated he would also follow-up on the additional \$40,000 and where it was designated to go.

A vote was taken on this item.

***K-3. Interim Financial Statements for the Period Ended January 31, 2016 (Approved)**

Approved the Interim Financial Statements for the Period Ended January 31, 2016.

L. OFFICE OF PORTFOLIO SERVICES

***L-1. Third Amendment to Charter School Agreement with Championship Academy of Distinction at Hollywood, Inc. on behalf of Championship Academy of Distinction at Hollywood - 5361 (Approved)**

Approved the Third Amendment to the Charter School Agreement with Championship Academy of Distinction at Hollywood, Inc. on behalf of Championship Academy of Distinction at Hollywood - 5361.

***L-2. Charter School Renewal Agreement - Excelsior Charter of Broward, Inc. (Approved)**

Approved the Charter School Renewal Agreement for Excelsior Charter of Broward, Inc., on behalf of Excelsior Charter of Broward - 5393.

OPEN ITEMS

AA. RESOLUTIONS

BB. BOARD MEMBERS

CC. BOARD POLICIES

CC-1. Proposed Revised Job Description for the Supervisor Professional Development Standards and Support Position (Not Approved)

Motion was made by Ms. Korn, seconded by Mrs. Bartleman, to approve the revised job description for the Supervisor Professional Development Standards and Support position. Approval is requested to advertise the position after the first reading. This is the first reading. (0-9 vote)

Agenda Items CC-1 and CC-2 were moved and discussed concurrently.

Mrs. Good inquired if the position for CC-1 was currently on the organizational structure.

Eric Chisem, Director, Talent Acquisition & Operations, replied yes, it was Board approved last year during the organizational chart changes. He believed the changes would attract more candidates for the position.

Mrs. Good stated most of the Minimum requirements were now listed under the Preferred requirements and asked if that was what they were trying to achieve.

Kathryn Sullivan, Director, Professional Development Standards & Support, responded this was a supervisor that supervised the system analyst so it was imperative they had the technological skills of understanding Systems, Applications & Products (SAP) and My Learning Plan so they could perform that work.

Mrs. Good referred to CC-2 and said she was concerned to have a degree or 60 credit hours as an additional requirement to attract a different type of applicant.

Mr. Chisem replied that was correct. They currently have a bilingual clerk, in which the individual has the opportunity for advancement and growth in the District by going back to school and receiving additional experience. When they look at neighboring universities and entities, they saw there was a lot of certification for obtaining additional degrees. That area has a high and rich demand so it provides an opportunity to grow, even within the District.

Mrs. Good commented that the District always needed more translators and was very excited this item was coming to the Board. She wanted to ensure that it would not adversely impact anyone who was currently a translator, to which staff said it would not.

Mrs. Rupert questioned in CC-1, how many respondents had there been to date.

Mr. Chisem replied 14 applied and 6 qualified, but would double check on the numbers because it was small.

Mrs. Rupert referred to the strikethrough copy and asked why in Professional Development was the Florida certification in an academic area language removed, or remove Professional Development in the new Preferred Qualifications & Experience, as well as the old Minimum Qualifications.

Mr. Chisem asked the hiring director to comment on that, but he said sometimes it was to get a bigger pool. It was a non-instructional position and initially was to attract some of the assistant principal population because they would have already had the Florida certification and Educational Leadership.

Mrs. Rupert expressed she was still uncomfortable removing the Florida certification in an academic area and Educational Leadership. In addition, if this was in the Professional Development field, why would it be removed as one of the qualifications.

Daniel Gohl, Chief Academic Officer, responded because he did not write the job description, he did not know but would get the answer for the Board.

Mrs. Rupert inquired on the update the Board received for CC-2, which was a one-pager, did the Preferred Qualifications remain the same on page 2 that was not attached.

Mr. Chisem replied the only change was on the Minimum Qualifications on page 1, everything remained the same currently on page 2.

Mrs. Bartleman had concerns that a master's degree was not required, Educational Leadership was not involved and only preferred, without a master's level they would oversee and monitor Professional Learning Communities at every school, felt it was down-graded.

Motion was made by Mrs. Bartleman, seconded by Mrs. Rupert to table Item CC-1 until later in the meeting. The motion and second were rescinded because Items CC-1 and CC-2 were motioned together at the beginning of discussion and would first have to be separated before tabling either item.

Motion to Separate (Carried)

Motion was made by Mrs. Good, seconded by Mrs. Rupert and carried to separate Agenda Items CC-1 and CC-2. Mrs. Freedman was absent for the vote. (8-0 vote)

Following a vote on the Motion to Separate Agenda Items CC-1 and CC-2, Item CC-1 was brought to the floor by motion made by Ms. Korn, seconded by Mrs. Bartleman and acclamation of the Board.

Motion to Table (Carried)

Motion was made by Mrs. Bartleman, seconded by Mrs. Rupert and carried to table Agenda Item CC-1 until later in the meeting. Mrs. Freedman was absent for the vote. (8-0 vote)

Following Agenda Item CC-2 and the lunch break, Agenda CC-1 was brought back to the floor for discussion by motion made by Ms. Korn, seconded by Ms. Murray and acclamation of the Board.

Mrs. Rupert re-stated her questions for staff as to how many respondents there were and why in Professional Development the Florida certification in an academic area was removed.

Ms. Sullivan responded in Professional Development Standards there were two shops. One is very much focused on the academics and those people work very closely with the people in Academics and with the schools. The other half of the shop is the System Analysts and those are the people who work very closely with maintaining My Learning Plan and SAP. Ms. Sullivan explained everything that goes into My Learning Plan has to be monitored and adjusted and it takes technical skills to do so. Then everything needs to be moved from My Learning Plan to SAP for certification records to be sent to the state. Their supervisor is necessary to understand the technical skills of their employees.

Mrs. Rupert said in viewing the Essential Performance Responsibilities, the fifth bullet down, she felt it pushed the academic aspect. She referred to the next two bullets and said she did not understand how one could oversee and monitor professional development learning if they did not have a certificate in an academic field.

Ms. Sullivan replied that work was really handled on the other side of the shop and they were looking for someone who new both. It was originally written for assistant principals but found that they did not have the technical skills that this position needed.

Mrs. Rupert would be more comfortable to have the Florida certification in an academic area added back under the Minimum Qualifications since the position works both the academics and technical sides, and not removing Professional Development in the new Preferred Qualifications, as well as the old Minimum Qualifications. Mrs. Rupert believed as a professional development position, the language should appear in the job description.

Ms. Sullivan stated it was more important for the work that needed to be done that the person had the technical understanding over the Florida certification and Educational Leadership.

Mrs. Rupert said she would not be able to vote for this item without the Florida certification in an academic area and Educational Leadership.

Mrs. Brinkworth had similar questions why all the Professional Development qualifications were removed for a professional development position. She asked staff what this person would do in this position.

Ms. Sullivan replied that person would assist and supervise the System Analysts, who were responsible for maintaining and registering for the blackboard courses, registering for My Learning Plan, making sure the information talks with SAP to ensure teachers inservice points are documented correctly, so it would primarily be systems work, a lot of Excel spreadsheets, and moving huge data files back and forth.

Mrs. Brinkworth inquired about her colleague's point on overseeing and monitoring the support for professional learning for the Essential Performance Responsibilities, and wanted to know if staff was referring to data or the actual implementation.

Ms. Sullivan responded when the Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) are established in the schools, there is a facilitator that has to register that PLC, My Learning Plan, and uploads documents. This person would oversee all those people to ensure everything is working together and if there were any glitches, to make sure they would be fixed.

Mrs. Brinkworth stated they would not be assisting with the facilitating of overseeing and monitoring of the PLCs, there is more compliance and suggested some wordsmithing to make it more clear and make her more comfortable.

Mrs. Bartleman felt they were just overseeing a project database and Excel spreadsheets and were making a salary of \$116,000.

Ms. Sullivan replied it was much more than a database and spreadsheets. The person would have to know HTML work and has to be able to do a lot of configuration in My Learning Plan, which is so technical she did not know all the aspects of it. The Plan was purchased out of the box but it has had to be tweaked for it to work in order to accomplish what it was meant to do.

Mrs. Bartleman had issues with the job description in general and was not sure she would support. She questioned if possibly spending \$116,000 for a person on a program that is not working, at what point would it be better to look at a different program that would be easier to operate and not require a full-time person for the position.

Ms. Sullivan stated it was a three-year contract and, although she will be retiring, she had already directed her staff to start looking now at what other systems/alternatives that would not require as much work. She said the system has been working nicely now, but it has taken a lot of work from her staff to configure it.

Mr. Runcie added there was virtually no large enterprise system that could be used in an organization of this magnitude that would not require support to make it work, whether it was SAP or this particular system, there would always be a lot of support work regardless of the system. On the front side, the ongoing, long-term maintenance cost would always be multiples of the actual software costs. When looking at the licensing, staff support to maintain and configure it, and integration that needs to occur with all the systems, there is nothing purchased that is turnkey in and of itself. There will not be a system in the marketplace that would not require an investment of staff to keep it going.

Ms. Sullivan continued although she had directed staff to investigate in a new system, it did not mean that the current may not end up being the best system, but they would still investigate the other options.

Mrs. Good asked Counsel what would happen if this were voted down.

Ms. Myrick replied this was a first reading so she would suggest it be approved and have it could come back with changes and it could be approved by the Board at the second reading. If the Board is not happy with the changes they can vote it down and come back for another first reading. It is possible that the Board could pass it at the second reading if the changes were acceptable.

Mrs. Good said she understood her colleagues' degree of being uncomfortable passing this and she would like to see it come back very differently as well.

Ms. Korn commented after reading the first two sentences under Position Goal, she understood this job to be very different than what was being described. She appreciated the intent but felt it should be better aligned comprehensively coming forward. She would prefer that the Board vote this down and come back with something very new. She believed the first two sentences under Position Goal needed to be re-written to help with the alignment.

Mrs. Rupert agreed with her colleague regarding the Position Goal, as well as the academic area aspect, and the Professional Development. She also pointed out her other concerns she mentioned previously.

Mr. Chisem acknowledged there were 46 applicants in the first pool and only 6 qualified. When they re-advertised they saw the same pool with the same individuals, and ran into the same challenges. Most were assistant principals with the certification, but lacked the project management/business enterprise skillset to enhance the services.

Dr. Osgood suggested as they have discussions about purchasing software in the future, they needed a discussion about a total cost with someone being able to manage that software. As technology continues to improve and move forward, software is complicated and someone is needed with a certain skill of expertise in order to utilize that software. The change will always create resistance. She encouraged staff to lay out the information so the Board would understand what the true needs were for this position.

A vote was taken on this item.

CC-2. Proposed New Job Description for the District Translator Position (Approved)

Motion was made by Ms. Korn, seconded by Mrs. Bartleman and carried, to approve the new job description for the District Translator position. This is the first reading. Mrs. Freedman was absent for the vote. (8-0 vote)

Agenda Items CC-1 and CC-2 were moved and discussed concurrently.

Motion to Separate (Carried)

Motion was made by Mrs. Good, seconded by Mrs. Rupert and carried to separate Agenda Items CC-1 and CC-2. Mrs. Freedman was absent for the vote. (8-0 vote)

Following a vote on the Motion to Separate Agenda Items CC-1 and CC-2, and discussion on Item CC-1, Agenda Item CC-2 was brought to the floor for discussion by motion made by Mrs. Good, seconded by Mrs. Rupert and acclamation of the Board.

Mrs. Bartleman inquired why the source of funding was from the general fund and Title III grant and not just for the Title III grant.

Vicky Saldala, Director, Bilingual/ESOL, replied those two general positions had always been funded from the general budget and the Portuguese translation, since it was an additional translation service, was funded out of Title III.

A vote was taken on this item.

DD. OFFICE OF THE CHIEF AUDITOR

EE. OFFICE OF STRATEGY & OPERATIONS

EE-1. Grant Applications - Post-Submission

(Approved)

Motion was made by Ms. Korn, seconded by Mrs. Rupert and carried, to approve the submission of the following grant applications (Items A - O):
A. American Academy of Dermatology..., \$8,000 (requested) B. Dart Foundation, \$5,000 (awarded) C. McCarthy Dressman Education Foundation..., \$30,000 (requested) D. National Wildlife..., \$500 (awarded) E. National Science Teachers Association, \$6,992 (awarded) F. Robert Lehman Foundation, \$20,000 (requested) G. Samsung Solve for Tomorrow, \$0 (in-kind donation) H. South Florida National Parks Trust, \$500 (awarded) I. TERRA Mini Grant, \$2,971 (awarded) J. The Able Trust..., \$65,000 (requested) K. Verizon Foundation..., \$20,000 (requested) L. VWR Foundation, \$10,000 (requested) M. Walmart Community Foundation Grants, \$2,500 (requested) N. Wells Fargo, \$500 (awarded) O. Whole Kids Foundation, \$2,000 (awarded). (9-0 vote)

Agenda Items EE-1 and EE-2 were moved and discussed concurrently.

Mrs. Rupert congratulated Park Ridge Elementary School for being awarded the Dart Foundation Grant of \$5,000.

Mrs. Rich Levinson commented although the item was not listed, she wanted to congratulate South Plantation High School for the XQ Super School project, in which they advanced to the final phase, out of 700 applications. This was a grant that Laurene Jobs, widow of Steve Jobs, gave \$50 million for 5-10 high schools to re-invent their high schools, basically from scratch. She thanked the Grants department for the other grants they worked on with the Centers for technology, as well as staff for their grants pertaining to the arts, science, technology, and engineering. She thanked Broward Education Foundation (BEF) for the teacher grants that were given out to Broward County teachers at a ceremony last week.

Ms. Korn referred to Item EE-2 on the U. S. Department of Education - Carol M. White Physical Education Program (PEP), and asked if this application had already been submitted or was going to be submitted.

Stephanie Pollard, Director, Grants Administration & Government Programs, replied this was a pre-submission grant item and would be due the beginning of May. They were collaborating with BEF as the lead applicant because they were considered a current recipient of Carol M. White PEP grant and could not apply as a lead applicant.

Ms. Korn asked how it would work in terms of the funds. If it is not coming directly to the District, was there a cost for the BEF to cover its own cost that would come from the \$800,000 since they would be serving that role for the District. She inquired if there would still be enough funds left over to deliver what was intended to be delivered.

Mr. Woods replied net the discount or whatever the fees were, with the money remaining the program would be written in a way that there was no out-of-pocket expense to the District based on the net amount received.

Ms. Korn thanked BEF for working on behalf of the District for this grant and acknowledged the schools and individuals, as noted in the agenda item, for going above and beyond to apply for and having grants awarded.

A vote was taken on these items.

EE-2. Grant Applications - Pre-Submission

(Approved)

Motion was made by Ms. Korn, seconded by Mrs. Rupert and carried, to approve the submission of the following grant applications (Items A - B):
A. State Farm Youth Advisory Board, \$100,000 (to be requested) B. U.S. Department of Education - Carol M. White Physical Education Program, \$800,000 (to be requested). (9-0 vote)

Agenda Items EE-1 and EE-2 were moved and discussed concurrently.

A vote was taken on these items.

EE-3. Agreement with Florida Atlantic University

(Approved)

Motion was made by Ms. Korn, seconded by Mrs. Rupert and carried, to approve the Agreement between The School Board of Broward County, Florida (SBBC) and Florida Atlantic University (FAU). The Agreement period shall be April 19, 2016 through September 30, 2016. (9-0 vote)

Mrs. Bartleman inquired how the 26 students were chosen and why that number was not more.

Deborah Porter, Coordinator, Talent Development, replied the 26 students were as many students as they could get because that was all that applied. They originally wanted 40 students. These were the 26 teachers with a temporary teaching certificate who were going to take the courses to maintain their job. The reason there were 26 was because FAU created a special track for these individuals and it stated in their contract 26 in order to schedule their faculty.

Mrs. Bartleman asked how many teachers were on temporary certificates.

Ms. Porter responded there were over 400 hired this year. This program was new. CareerSource contacted them last year and said they had funding for tuition to cover these teachers towards the end of their three-year teaching certificate. When they had an orientation, 40 teachers showed an interest and they took the 26 that were able to do it. What was good about this program with CareerSource is if a teacher with a temporary certificate only needed two or three teaching courses, they could be funneled through FAU.

Mrs. Bartleman felt with 400 teachers, more should be taking advantage of the program.

Ms. Porter stated they do market, but the teachers have three (3) years to complete course requirements. The first year is very difficult so they try to catch them in their second year and provide support for them in order to be successful in retaining their employment. The 26 teachers were mostly second year teachers.

Mrs. Rupert inquired if this included the STAR program teachers.

Ms. Porter replied the STAR program was a transition to teaching grant and was sunsetted.

Mrs. Rupert asked if there were any thoughts to go for it again.

Ms. Porter said she looks every year for the funding and they have been working with Talent Acquisition & Operations to acquire those teachers.

Mrs. Bartleman commented on a side note teachers have found it difficult to get access to instructional personnel, receive answers, and navigate the system. She asked staff to look into it and see if it could be made more user-friendly.

A vote was taken on this item.

EE-4. First Amendment to the Agreement with the Sheriff of Broward County, Florida (Approved)

Motion was made by Mrs. Bartleman, seconded by Mrs. Rupert and carried, to approve the Amendment Agreement between The School Board of Broward County, Florida (SBBC) and the Sheriff of Broward County, Florida (Sheriff). Contract Term is July 1, 2015 to June 30, 2016. (9-0 vote)

Mrs. Brinkworth inquired why this item was an EE item and not an F item as stated in the backup.

Valerie Wanza, Chief School Performance & Accountability Officer, replied the principal was very pro-active and went forward to the Broward Sheriff's Office (BSO) to seek a grant to pay for the fees for the inmates when they took their General Education Diploma (GED). Since the BSO basically awarded the school a grant, she wanted to follow District protocol to receive the money so the school could access it for the students.

Mrs. Bartleman was happy the Sheriff's office had this grant and that it was the goal to rehabilitate. The District does not always have money for the GEDs.

Dr. Wanza thanked the principal, Mr. Howard, who initiated this grant.

A vote was taken on this item.

EE-5. Piggyback Recommendation of \$500,000 or Less - 56-092R - School Buses (Approved)

Motion was made by Mrs. Rupert, seconded by Ms. Korn and carried, to approve the recommendation to award for the above contract. Contract Term: April 20, 2016 through June 30, 2017, 14 Months; User Department: Student Transportation & Fleet Services; Award Amount: \$210,000; Awarded Vendors(s): Florida Transportation Systems, Inc.; Matthews Buses, Inc.; and Sun State International Trucks, LLC; M/WBE Vendors(s): None. (9-0 vote)

No discussion was held on this item.

A vote was taken on this item.

**EE-6. Recommendation for Additional Spending Authority - 14-018R -
Supply and Install Sod (SEE ITEM E-5) (Postponed)**

Motion was made by Mrs. Rupert, seconded by Ms. Korn, to approve an increase in 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: \$830,347; Awarded Vendor(s): Odums Sod, Inc.; M/WBE Vendor(s): Odums Sod, Inc. **This motion was superseded by Motions to Postpone (page 32) and Amend (page 33).** Mrs. Bartleman and Mrs. Freedman were absent for the vote. (7-0 vote)

Agenda Item E-5 and EE-6 were moved and discussed concurrently.

Motion to Table (Carried)

Motion was made by Ms. Murray, seconded by Mrs. Rich Levinson and carried, to table Items E-5 and EE-6 until later in the meeting to allow staff to gather the requested information for the Board. (9-0 vote)

A vote was taken on the Motion to Table.

Following Agenda Item I-2, Agenda Items E-5 and EE-6 were brought back to the floor by motion made by Mrs. Rupert, seconded by Mrs. Good and acclamation of the Board.

Mr. Woods requested the items be separated so that Item E-5 could be voted on and Item EE-6 could be postponed to the next Board meeting in order to allow staff to gather the requested information and provide an analysis for the Board.

Motion to Separate (Carried)

Motion was made by Mrs. Good, seconded by Mrs. Rupert and carried to separate Agenda Items E-5 and EE-6. Mrs. Bartleman and Mrs. Freedman were absent for the vote. (7-0 vote)

A vote was taken on the Motion to Separate.

Motion to Postpone

Motion was made by Mrs. Rich Levinson, seconded by Mrs. Good to postpone Agenda Item EE-6 until the May 3, 2016 Regular School Board Meeting.

Ms. Korn asked what impact, if any, would there be if this item was delayed until May 3, 2016.

Mr. Woods replied for the large projects, none of them were scheduled to start until the May-June period and would not be a problem. For the small-ticket items that come forth within the next two weeks, they would be moved through the "Under the \$50,000" vehicle to move the work forward. He said they were very confident there would not be any projects within the next two weeks that they could not address that may arise.

Mrs. Good would like to have the information added sooner to another meeting if possible.

Mr. Moquin suggested that the item be added to the Special School Board Meeting on April 26, 2016.

Motion to Amend Motion to Postpone (Carried)

Motion was made by Mrs. Rich Levinson, seconded by Mrs. Good and carried, to amend the postponed Agenda Item EE-6 until the April 26, 2016 Special School Board Meeting instead of the May 3, 2016 Regular School Board meeting. Mrs. Bartleman and Mrs. Freedman were absent for the vote. (7-0 vote)

A vote was taken on the Motion to Postpone as Amended.

**EE-7. Recommendation for Additional Spending Authority - 14-082F -
Electrical Services (Approved)**

Motion was made by Mrs. Bartleman, seconded by Mrs. Rupert and carried, to approve an increase in the spending authority for the above contract. Contract Term: November 13, 2014 through November 12, 2017, 3 Years; User Department: Physical Plant Operations (PPO), Custodial and Grounds, and Energy Management; New Award Amount: \$3,515,000; Awarded Vendor(s): C & F Electric, Inc.; Francis Uriel Electric, Inc.; and Universal Electric of Florida, Inc.; M/WBE Vendor(s): Francis Uriel Electric, Inc. (9-0 vote)

Mrs. Good inquired where staff came up with the additional spend authority.

Sam Bays, Director, Physical Plant Operations, replied they did not have the demands then as they do now. The request for the new spend authority was covered in the Executive Summary.

Mrs. Brinkworth asked if there were additional emergency projects pending. Also, she wanted to know if there was going to be any impact to the General Obligation Bond (GOB).

Mr. Bays stated the projects provided to the Board in supplement were the ones incurred. There were no anticipated emergencies. In regards to the GOB, he said there was not any money programmed in for that work.

Mrs. Brinkworth conveyed to the Superintendent that the spend authority would never be enough if staff did not check the historical spend and what the impact of the SMART projects would be.

Mr. Woods commented if there was a line item for the GOB they make an attempt to include that for the spend forecast. For some items such as electrical work, it would be hard for them to estimate how the GOB would impact it, so what they bring forth would be a very conservative spend request. As they get more into the GOB work and have more data and information, they can then make better projections on how the bond work would impact some of the PPO items.

Mrs. Rich Levinson stated on paper all the vendors looked the same; however, the time it would take them was the difference in the price of the job. She questioned if all vendors with the same time and labor were looked at in their performance to ensure the District was getting the biggest bang for its buck.

Mr. Bays said that they were working to ensure that was happening.

Ms. Korn asked whenever a new contract is brought to the Board and staff knows the spend authority at that time is not going to cover that contract, the additional spend authority should be brought at the same time as the contract. She said approving a contract and approving a spend authority are two different actions and it may be helpful as a good practice when contracts come forward to check the spend authority to determine if the amount would be sufficient or not so the Board does not have to go through this process twice.

A vote was taken on this item.

EE-8. Piggyback Recommendation of \$500,000 or Greater - 56-088B - Floor Coverings with Related Supplies, Equipment, and Services (Postponed)

Motion was made by Ms. Korn, seconded by Mrs. Rupert to approve the recommendation to award for the above contract. Contract Term: April 20, 2016 through February 28, 2017, 10 Months; User Department: Physical Plant Operations (PPO); Award Amount: \$1,200,000; Awarded Vendor(s): Bentley Mills, Inc., Continental Flooring Company, Interface Americas, Inc., Milliken Services, LLC, Mohawk Carpet Distribution, Inc., Shaw Industries, Inc., Tandus Centiva US LLC; M/WBE Vendor(s): None. **This motion was superseded by a Motion to Postpone (page 36).** (9-0 vote)

Mrs. Rich Levinson referred to page 2 with the proposed carpet projects. She stated she was not referring to what projects these were for but rather to the unit costs. She had requested the percentages spent on carpet tile and broadloom, as well as the unit costs, and asked staff to explain the unit costs.

Mr. Bays responded the range of broadloom would be from \$14.88 to \$20 per square yard (PSY) and from \$13.59 to \$20 PSY. The estimate she requested for a recent project was \$14.88 per yard for broadloom and \$14.88 per yard for carpet tile.

Mrs. Rich Levinson was concerned that the labor costs were more than double than the costs of the goods. Even if the cost were \$30 PSY, the first school on the list, Virginia S. Young Elementary, would have to have 1,000 square yards in the job to be completed for \$30,000. She said that was impossible because when she visited the school, although she could not walk around because they were testing, she was able to estimate by looking at the ceiling and determined it was no more than 400 sq. yds., so the forecast was more than double on that one item. She told the Superintendent if it was like this in this trade where she has been in the business for 25 years, she was afraid to see what was happening with other trades. Mrs. Rich Levinson stated the prices for the goods were acceptable, but the costs on the jobs were wrong. She requested staff to provide further backup. In addition, schools should be given a choice as to what they want installed. She has been told they have not been given that option and were instructed which flooring they had to purchase.

Ms. Korn did not have the experience as her colleague, but having the experience in commercial real estate working with contractors on a regular basis doing the commercial installation, which included working after hours and around people's furnishings, she agreed that something was not adding up. For carpet tile, if it was not being used in a way where pieces would be pulled up and replaced when needed, there would not be a value in using the carpet tile. She would like to see the information as well.

Mrs. Freedman asked staff to verify the total number of square yards they are contracting when providing their follow-up to the Board. She concurred with her colleague that in most commercial businesses, work such as this takes place after hours and on weekends. She suggested staff may want to look into separating the two costs of goods and labor to determine if a better price could be obtained.

Mr. Runcie recommended postponing this item and possibly having some conversations with a few external vendors.

Mr. Bobadilla said he would look into not piggybacking this item and exploring the District doing this itself. He said they would look at how these jobs were being estimated and would obtain some quotes that delineated the costs and quantities.

Mrs. Rich Levinson reiterated she was not questioning what was provided with the square yard price of the material if that was correct; the problem was with the labor. She was not interested in breaking it up. Her concern was there were schools that were tied to this and jobs involving safety that needed to be completed. She wanted to know how to proceed. If the contract was a good contract, she could approve the contract for buying the goods, but she could not approve the unit costs for each job.

Mr. Bobadilla replied if there was a desire to approve this, the understanding with the numbers in the contract were simply rough order estimates and before they started the work, they would share the actual numbers with the Board that they received from the vendor before proceeding.

Mrs. Rich Levinson said that would be fine. If they were all like the first job, the amount of projects could have been doubled.

Ms. Korn asked if the suggestion was to approve this and come back with the numbers, because the item specifically states it was awarding \$1.2 million and she was uncomfortable with approving it that way, unless staff wanted to amend the amount.

Mr. Bobadilla responded they could reduce the number or approve it as a "not to exceed" number, knowing at the end the actual numbers would be what are in the state contract.

Mr. Runcie stated in either case it would be difficult to determine an estimate until they make sense of what that is and suggested bringing the item back to the next Board meeting since it would not create any significant issues with current work in the meantime. He would like to bring this back in two weeks in order to allow staff to have the opportunity to double-check the square footage, validate the pricing, and possibly get a third part bid to determine a reference point. He believed that was the most prudent path forward for everyone in order to have a better understanding.

Motion to Postpone (Carried)

Motion was made by Mrs. Rich Levinson, seconded by Mrs. Freedman and carried, to postpone this item until the May 3, 2016 Regular School Board Meeting. (9-0 vote)

A vote was taken on the Motion to Postpone.

FF. OFFICE OF ACADEMICS

FF-1. Cooperative Agreement between The School Board of Broward County, Florida and Knowledge Delivery Systems, Inc. (POSTPONED 4/5/16 RSBM) MEMO TO VOTE DOWN (Not Approved)

Motion was made by Ms. Korn, seconded by Mrs. Rupert, to approve the Cooperative Agreement between The School Board of Broward County, Florida and Knowledge Delivery Systems, Inc. (0-9 vote)

Mrs. Rupert asked if this had gone through legal and if there was a copy of a Request for Proposal (RFP).

Mr. Gohl replied, not at this time.

Mrs. Rupert wanted to ensure when they get to that level that the RFP was available to see.

A vote was taken on this item.

GG. OFFICE OF HUMAN RESOURCES

HH. OFFICE OF THE GENERAL COUNSEL

HH-1. Settlement Agreement between The School Board of Broward County, Florida and Schenkel & Shultz, Inc. (Approved)

Motion was made by Ms. Korn, seconded by Mrs. Brinkworth and carried, to approve the Settlement Agreement between The School Board of Broward County, Florida and Schenkel & Shultz, Inc. (9-0 vote)

No discussion was held on this item.

A vote was taken on this item.

II. OFFICE OF THE SUPERINTENDENT

II-1. Increase Spending Authority to Account for Property and Casualty Insurance Premium Increases - Fiscal Years 2016-2018 (Approved)

Motion was made by Mrs. Rupert, seconded by Ms. Korn and carried, to approve increase spending authority for RFI 14-063P, Property and Casualty Insurance Brokerage Services, to account for the property and casualty insurance premium increases for fiscal years 2016-2018. Mrs. Freedman voted no. (8-1 vote)

Mrs. Freedman appreciated staff's explanation for increasing limits; however, she did not agree with their rationale, Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) or the state for raising the District's insurance limits. She advised the Board she would not be supporting this item.

Mr. Moquin responded that the limits were not increasing. He said the limits were increased last year and this item covers the spend authority to cover that increase premium out for the term of the contract, as well as in lieu of a premium reduction to buy-down the deductible. He stated they were potentially interested in raising limits further, but that would be in discussion for next year when they see what happens in the marketplace.

Mrs. Freedman said she misunderstood and was under the impression that the District was also receiving increased limits with the money. She asked if the District was not receiving increased limits but just lowering the deductible for the money.

Aston Henry, Director, Risk Management, replied last year the limits were increased up to \$200 million. He said they want to maintain that limit and lower the deductible by \$25 million.

Mrs. Freedman asked how much of an increase was the District paying to lower the deductible.

Mr. Henry referred to the last page of the agenda item, page 5, where it showed an increase of \$2 million for the 2016-2017 school year.

Mrs. Freedman reiterated that she was not comfortable at this time spending \$2 million to lower the potential risk by \$25 million because she did not see the added benefit.

Mr. Henry stated he had been in contact with the Department of Insurance and was asked why, based on the soft market, the District was not choosing to increase its limits. Last year the District received a letter of Reasonableness, stating the rates were reasonable but this year it did not receive that letter. He said what they were trying to do was put the District in the best situation to show post-storm that it put forth its best effort to increase its limits and lower its deductible, which lowers FEMA's exposure and hopefully that would provide a Letter of Reasonableness.

Mrs. Freedman said she was going to hold firm to not spending \$2 million at this time when the state did not give the District an increase per pupil in funding, because spending the money for insurance was not what she would consider reasonable and would not be giving her support. She asked staff if the District was still trying to collect from FEMA from the last storm and how long had it been.

Mr. Henry answered yes they were still trying to collect and it had been 10 years since the last storm/hurricane. He said \$47 million had been collected and \$5.5 million was still being recovered.

Mr. Moquin said there was no budget request for this item. This was for additional spend authority. Last year, because of an inquiry by the Department of Insurance and them asking questions about the District's program compared to other large South Florida entities, there were concerns the District's limits were too low and its ability to obtain a Reasonableness letter would be in jeopardy in the subsequent year, so the limits were then increased from \$135 million to \$200 million. That budget was addressed through a budget amendment last year. He said they were not increasing limits beyond what they were. This was a good faith gesture to FEMA.

Ms. Korn was concerned the District did not have the letter of Reasonableness but felt by not approving this it would give FEMA an opportunity to not provide a letter of Reasonableness. She said the fact that the District was able to recover \$47 million from FEMA, it is \$47 million the District would not have received if it were not aligned for that reasonableness. She was not a big fan in paying for insurance but believed there was a level of responsibility that needed to be taken and long-term this would save the District money. She said she would be supporting this.

Mrs. Good concurred.

Mrs. Rich Levinson commented that she had been working some of the federal legislators on the collections from FEMA. Currently it is with Senator Rubio's office and they have recovered an additional \$428,000 on February 12, 2016. They also recovered a couple other million. It was \$10 million and is now down to \$5.5 million so they have been working on getting that figure down and she wanted everyone to know his office has really assisted with the recovery of the money.

A vote was taken on this item.

JJ. OFFICE OF FACILITIES AND CONSTRUCTION

JJ-1. Partial Release of Retainage - Cooper City High School - Skanska USA Building, Inc. - Phased Replacement (Phase A) - Project No. P.000877 (Approved)

Motion was made by Mrs. Brinkworth, seconded by Ms. Korn and carried, to approve the Partial Release of Retainage for Skanska USA Building, Inc., Phased Replacement (Phase A), Project No. P.000877, in the amount of \$780,437. (9-0 vote)

No discussion was held on this item.

April 19, 2016

Minutes of Regular Meeting
Page 39 of 43

A vote was taken on this item.

KK. OFFICE OF FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT

LL. OFFICE OF PORTFOLIO SERVICES

LL-1. 2016 High School Graduation Facility Rental Agreement with Broward College (Omni Auditorium) (Approved)

Motion was made by Mrs. Rupert, seconded by Ms. Korn and carried, to approve the 2016 High School Graduation Facility Rental Agreement with Broward College for Atlantic Technical College. Mrs. Rich Levinson was absent for the vote. (8-0 vote)

Agenda Items LL-1 through LL-4 were moved and discussed concurrently.

Mrs. Freedman thought the parking for Nova Southeastern University (NSU) was included and asked staff to speak on it.

Leslie Brown, Chief Portfolio Services Officer, replied that the parking was not included and that there had always been a fee for the parking.

Michael Roland, Athletics Liaison, said they charged on the level parking field and the garage. Last year they did not charge.

Mrs. Freedman asked why this year was different. A huge problem she noticed was the backup of traffic and the time it had taken trying to get in, as well as an issue with the cost of parking.

Mr. Roland stated NSU wanted to try something different this year to alleviate some of the traffic congestion and move the cars in and out more quickly. This year they had the schools selling parking tickets for \$7, where \$5 went to NSU and \$2 went to the school. It is an experiment but they were told at negotiations it would move traffic quicker and keep the price to \$11,000 for the graduation. Mr. Roland said if the Board did not want to approve this, the cost would go up because NSU would have to hire more people to handle the parking.

Mrs. Freedman said last year when there was no charge, the flow was just fine. Now they are trying to see how they can make more money on the District's graduations. If NSU can hold almost 4,000 people and approximately 2,000 cars, that equates to \$10,000 for parking plus \$11,000 per graduation for a total of over \$21,000 for each graduation at NSU. That is more than the University of Miami (UM) at \$16,000 for the largest school in the county for one graduation.

Mrs. Brown stated they had worked very hard with all of the venues and did not have any luck in having any of them budge. They did have last year where they were allowed to park without charge; however, NSU is being very strong and persistent that the District has to pay for parking. The only place they did not have a problem with a parking challenge was at War Memorial Auditorium. This year with the direction of the Board to try to get the best venues for the students, they were able to negotiate the prices down a little, but not the parking, so all the students would be able to be in NSU, Broward Center for the Performing Arts, or the other three sites. Mrs. Brown said this year they have had to rotate schools in and out of War Memorial, based on the number of students in each class. Her team was able to stay within the budget reduce the expenses over the past few years of over \$100,000. She stated they would continue to work on the parking situation.

Mrs. Freedman did not have problem paying NSU for the venue but not when UM was only charging \$16,000 for the venue and parking for the largest school, whereas NSU had schools much smaller in size. She would have been more comfortable if the parking was included in the venue.

Mrs. Brown offered to go back this year when they negotiate to have the parking included in the price of the venue.

Mrs. Freedman appreciates that people are needed to assist at parking, but she did not understand why the District was being asked to pay more for smaller graduation classes at venue and where the school was spending their time to sell the parking tickets versus another venue, which is also a university, that will host the largest school/ graduating class in the county and was not charging for parking for a lot less. The cost of a graduation at NSU will be close to \$25,000 after paying for the venue and parking. The burden ends up on the student and their family.

Mrs. Rich Levinson said NSU's price has not changed. It is about supply and demand and NSU is one of the only venues that can accommodate the students. She agreed it was costing over \$20,000 per graduation and suggested the Superintendent could get involved by speaking with NSU's President.

Dr. Osgood commented the situation should be viewed both ways because often the District charges cities or other entities to park or use its property(ies). She also agreed with her colleague that it was about supply and demand; however, in building partnerships, the approach should be of one that was cost-effective. It might be beneficial looking into a multi-year contract with NSU instead one that was year-to-year.

Mrs. Rupert referred to page 25 of the contract and inquired if the District was required to pay for two parking passes for wherever parents attended or not.

Mr. Roland responded no, NSU was planning on two passes per student as a start and if more were needed they would supply more.

Ms. Myrick stated she read it to mean that each school would be responsible for two passes per student at a fee of \$5 each. She asked staff if 800 students were going to be responsible for \$8,000 to return back to NSU.

Mr. Roland replied not according to his conversations. He said the school would not be responsible for any returned parking passes.

Mrs. Brinkworth had the same question as her colleague regarding the parking passes and asked Counsel if she was comfortable with the contract language.

Ms. Myrick said she had concerns; however, if staff was confident of the intent that schools would not be charged for all returned passes, she would allow the contract to go through. She advised staff to ensure all schools were informed to retain any unsold passes so they could turn them in to NSU and not be charged and suggested the language was changed in the contract next year.

A vote was taken on these items.

LL-2. 2016 High School Graduation Use License Agreement with Nova Southeastern University (Approved)

Motion was made by Mrs. Rupert, seconded by Ms. Korn and carried, to approve the 2016 High School Graduation Use License Agreement with Nova Southeastern University for seventeen graduation ceremonies at the Don Taft University Center. Mrs. Rich Levinson was absent for the vote. (8-0 vote)

Agenda Items LL-1 through LL-4 were moved and discussed concurrently.

A vote was taken on these items.

LL-3. 2016 High School Graduation License Agreement with Global Spectrum, L.P., (BankUnited Center at the University of Miami) (Approved)

Motion was made by Mrs. Rupert, seconded by Ms. Korn and carried, to approve the 2016 High School Graduation License Agreement with Global Spectrum, L.P. for BankUnited Center at the University of Miami. Mrs. Rich Levinson was absent for the vote. (8-0 vote)

Agenda Items LL-1 through LL-4 were moved and discussed concurrently.

A vote was taken on these items.

LL-4. 2016 High School Graduation License Agreement with Performing Arts Center Authority, Broward Center for the Performing Arts (Approved)

Motion was made by Mrs. Rupert, seconded by Ms. Korn and carried, to approve the 2016 High School Graduation License Agreement with Performing Arts Center Authority, Broward Center for the Performing Arts, for twelve graduation ceremonies. Mrs. Rich Levinson was absent for the vote. (8-0 vote)

Agenda Items LL-1 through LL-4 were moved and discussed concurrently.

A vote was taken on these items.

LL-5. Renewal of Lease Agreement between The School Board of Broward County, Florida, and BrightStar Credit Union (POSTPONED 4/5/16 RSBM) REVISED MEMO TO VOTE DOWN (Not Approved)

Motion was made by Mrs. Rupert, seconded by Ms. Korn, to approve the renewal of the Lease Agreement between The School Board of Broward County, Florida, and BrightStar Credit Union. Mrs. Rich Levinson was absent for the vote. (8-0 vote)

No discussion was held on this item.

A vote was taken on this item.

LL-6. Approval To Notify Silva of South Florida, Inc., (Pathways Academy K-8 Center - 5372), of The Proposed Termination (Approved)

Motion was made by Mrs. Rupert, seconded by Ms. Korn and carried, to authorize the Superintendent to notify Silva of South Florida, Inc., (Pathways Academy K-8 Center - 5372), of the proposed termination of the Charter School Agreement upon ninety (90) days notice pursuant to Section 1002.33(8)(b), Florida Statutes. (9-0 vote)

No discussion was held on this item.

A vote was taken on this item.

Adjournment This meeting was adjourned at 6:48 p.m.

/dvn