

Approved in Open Board Meeting September 7, 2016

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

May 31, 2016
Tuesday, 9:30 a.m.

MINUTES OF SPECIAL MEETING
(Organizational Chart)

The School Board of Broward County, Florida, met in special session at 9:30 a.m., Tuesday, May 31, 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 Call to Order was followed by the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America.

Added/Changed Items

- Revised: Item 1

Close Agenda Upon motion by Mrs. Rupert, seconded by Ms. Korn and carried, the Agenda was approved and declared closed. (9-0 vote)

Purpose of Meeting For The School Board of Broward County, Florida to approve The School Board of Broward County, Florida 2016-2017 Organizational Chart, and any other items the Board deems necessary.

Superintendent's Recommendation

- 1. The School Board of Broward County, Florida 2016-2017 Organizational Chart
(Approved as Amended)**

Motion was made by Mrs. Rupert, seconded by Ms. Korn and carried, to approve The School Board of Broward County, Florida 2016-2017 Organizational Chart. **This motion was superseded by Motions to Amend (pages 25-26).** Mrs. Bartleman, Mrs. Freedman, and Ms. Korn were absent for the vote. (6-0 vote)

Jeffrey Moquin, Chief of Staff, provided a general overview of the proposed organizational changes, which included the District's Police Department. He said position eliminations were made in order to keep the General Fund cost-neutral as discussed at a previous workshop.

The Chair indicated the process would be to review the Organizational Chart (Org. Chart) page-by-page, starting with page 1.

Mrs. Good asked for clarification as to whether or not the Board had the flexibility to make changes.

Ms. Myrick replied yes and said that the statute allowed the Board to decide which positions they wanted and how to fund those positions.

Ms. Korn thought the Org. Chart belonged to the Superintendent and not the Board.

Ms. Myrick read the statute and interpreted it to mean the Board had the power to determine the positions on the Org. Chart and that the Superintendent would recommend the positions that needed to be filled.

Ms. Korn stated the Board had been advised when an individual was brought forward, unless there was just cause, the Board had to accept that individual. She said based on what the General Counsel read, the interpretation seemed to be that the Superintendent could recommend, and once the recommendation was made, it was in the hands of the Board.

Ms. Myrick responded it would be for the position, not the individual to fill the position. She indicated there was another part in the statute that clearly said the Board could only not accept the person for just cause. She reiterated the Board was to designate the positions and to prescribe the qualifications.

Ms. Korn replied that she saw a difference in designating a position and the Org. Chart. The designation of a position basically stated that a position existed in the District that had a job description associated with it. How the District runs and operates on a day-to-day basis would be the Org. Chart; that was the distinction between the two. She said the Board was emphatically advised in the past that this (Org. Chart) belonged to the Superintendent. Ms. Korn expressed being uncomfortable voting on something with such a drastic difference in legal interpretation as to what the Board could do. As a Board Member who has a part in hiring and firing the Superintendent, Ms. Korn was not comfortable with his running the District day-to-day and then telling him how he had to do it to be successful. She conveyed she would absolutely share her comments and say what she liked or disliked, but she was not comfortable emphatically telling him she would not approve something when he knows his job was contingent on this working.

Mrs. Rupert stated this conversation came up last year when she and some of her colleagues inquired about it. She read from the June 23, 2015 Regular School Board Meeting minutes that former General Counsel, Paul Carland, replied that as it pertained to the Organizational Chart, the Board had discretion to dictate changes if it was in the Board's will; in the case for personnel appointments where the Superintendent was nominating a person to fill a position, the Board would be restricted by the good cause; when it comes to making changes to a proposed chart or job descriptions, the Board would not have that restriction; and if the Board ultimately made those changes, the Superintendent would have to implement the changes. She continued reading that Mr. Carland clarified the Org. Chart was a pictorial description of positions that the Board created and who they report to in the District. The reporting structure was something the Board could designate with job descriptions so the Org. Chart should come simultaneously or after the job descriptions were changed or created.

Mrs. Rupert said last year was the first time anything contrary was mentioned that it was not the Superintendent's Org. Chart and caught the Board by surprise. She said it was confusing hearing both sides; however, as one Board Member, she listened to Mr. Carland last year and was going to listen to General Counsel this year and offer her analysis and perspective of the Org. Chart as to how it would best help the District.

Mrs. Bartleman felt comfortable making changes because the Org. Chart pertained to boxes, which represented positions and not people directly. She concurred with Ms. Myrick's opinion.

Mrs. Good stated after every Board Member spoke, she did not want any one to vote no to the structure of what would guide the District simply their view or opinion was agreed to by the majority of the Board. She expressed that it was important everyone listen to each other, including the Superintendent, and hopefully come to a compromised position.

Dr. Osgood commented if the Board was to make drastic changes to a page and it did not work, how could the Superintendent be evaluated on something the Board created. She had been told for four (4) years not to get involved with the day-to-day operations and the Org. Chart 100% impacts the day-to-day operations. Her concern was when it was time for the Superintendent's evaluation and something did not work, he could say it was because he asked for one thing but the Board gave him something else.

Ms. Myrick agreed and with some of the other comments as well. The issue was that the Superintendent prepared the Org. Chart and it was his recommendation on how the District should be organized and staffed, which was what he was hired to do. The Board could probably create a whole new department, but it would not be a good idea. There would be ways to modify or tweak this if the Board chose to do so. There is a compromise in taking the recommendation away from the Superintendent, but the Board does have the right to designate a position to be filled. Ms. Myrick said this fell under the personnel area in state statute.

Mrs. Rupert stated when someone was hired, whatever existed in that organizational structure was what they were responsible for, so she felt it was the Superintendent's job to make it work, even if changes were to be made to the Org. Chart. She believed the Board had the flexibility to make changes to the boxes.

Mrs. Good suggested having public comments, postpone the Board meeting in order to have the Closed Door Session, and then reconvene the Board meeting to discuss this item.

Mrs. Rupert concurred.

Mr. Moquin recalled Mr. Carland's comments on the Org. Chart and that it was a visual representation of the job descriptions that the Board approves and weighs in on. He indicated the Superintendent and leadership team have shown that it respects and values the feedback from the Board and has taken into account what the Board has requested. He said moving forward, it should be a collaborative effort and one in which the Superintendent could support in order to affect day-to-day operations.

Motion to Table (Carried)

Motion was made by Mrs. Bartleman, seconded by Mrs. Good and carried to table this item until after the Closed Door Session. (9-0 vote)

Following the Closed Door Session the Board reconvened.

There were no comments from the Board on pages 1 or 2 of the Org. Chart.

Page 3

Mrs. Rupert disagreed with moving the Leadership Development, as well as Coaching & Induction to this page. She was going to wait to make her comments until the end of the Org. Chart for these items because she wanted to address Talent Development as a whole.

Mrs. Rich Levinson also did not agree with Talent Development being divided out, in particular, Coaching & Induction. The District had been recognized nationally for what it was doing with coaching and she was very concerned with it being siloed and it being in different areas and not under Talent Development.

Mrs. Brinkworth echoed the same sentiments.

Based on the comments made by her colleagues, Mrs. Good asked for staff's perspective, as well as the Superintendent's. She wanted to know if there was not an ability to address the concerns raised, was there an opportunity to do so in some fashion, and if not, to delineate why.

Mr. Runcie wanted to first address his perspective on the overall Org. Chart process and said it was a collaborative effort between the Superintendent and the School Board. He indicated he could not be more effective than what the School Board allows him to be. He felt they have demonstrated that they have tried to listen and have made adjustments when necessary. To the specific on this particular item, he was very comfortable that the changes allowed for more effective collaboration and alignment of the work.

Valerie Wanza, Chief School Performance & Accountability Officer, spoke on the two departments proposed to move to Office of School Performance & Accountability (OSPA). The Leadership Development actually facilitates and oversees the pre-service programs of individuals aspiring to become principals, assistant principals (APs), and teacher leaders. OSPA was the office that facilitates and provides the professional development for sitting administrators.

Dr. Wanza said in this recommendation they were aligning the work and ensuring the pre-service that administrators and teacher leaders were receiving, such as the training and the job-embedded practices, was aligned to the training currently transpired through the Cadre models, which are co-facilitated with Academics and support from Talent Development.

Mr. Runcie added the important point was by ensuring the process they had, in terms of how principals and APs were selected, there was fairness and equity in the selection solely. It was one of the things he spoke about to Dr. Wanza and to certainly have it as a performance goal this year to continue to enhance that process and to lay out some additional things that would make it clear.

Mrs. Good appreciated the explanations and while she respected the comments by her colleagues, she wanted to understand the perspective of where it was now and to where it was going.

Dr. Wanza said the Leadership Development department currently oversees all training for pre-service and it may or may not be connected to some of the experiences principals and APs have currently in the position. There was an intentional plan that pre-service, professional learning, as well as current professional learning that principals, APs, and teacher leaders were receiving now, was aligned and connected. In respect to the whole selection piece, they have done some very intentional things to ensure OSPA was not the office selecting individuals for recommended positions.

On the principal selection process, Dr. Wanza indicated they had representatives from Academics, Human Resources (HR), Talent Development, as well as OSPA, when they have the first round of interviews before they select participants to go to community panels. She stated they use a very broad cross-section of administrators throughout the District to sit on panels because they have experiences with individuals seeking positions, so they do receive input from multiple departments when they select individuals to recommend to go forward in the principal selection process. She said that same process would be the same for interim principals, LEAD, and such. Talent Development was not a single entity but multiple individuals collaborating on a selection process.

Dr. Wanza referred to the box with three (3) additional OSPA positions and stated they were being funded by the Wallace Foundation. The other box with one (1) additional position was repositioned from the current Director of Strategic Achievement to a Cadre Director in order to have 2-3 Cadre Directors focused on the most fragile schools and lowering the span of control within the number of schools Cadre Directors currently supervise. Dr. Wanza said the average number of schools for each Cadre Director was about 22 but with these additional positions, the numbers would be reduced and the Cadre Directors would each have approximately 13-14 schools.

Mrs. Good asked if staff felt this was more conducive to moving this District forward and, if so, how did she envision that happening.

Dr. Wanza replied yes. She stated she had already re-shuffled schools into different Cadres, from 11 to 15, and they would focus solely on the schools that were assigned in their Cadre.

Mrs. Good questioned staff if there was anything that could be added to address some of the issues by her colleagues that were raised as to what was being proposed.

Mrs. Rupert asked to have the Chief Talent Development Officer page (previously page 18) reinstated as it was to solidify the department and focus on talent development for all employees.

Mrs. Brinkworth said the neutrality was part of her concern as well and the ability to mentor and nurture without a fear. She wanted to know how staff was ensuring that it was truly supportive and not in any way seen as punitive or a way to be penalized for having that relationship with a mentor/coach. Mrs. Brinkworth continued that her concern was where it would be housed in the organization; the view would be that it was not a neutral place for those people to be working.

Mr. Runcie replied the relationships with the induction coaches had not changed. In regards to her latter concern, he responded that she made a valid point and he would ponder it as the discussion continued.

Dr. Wanza added it was a different presence when the Chief walks in with the Director of Coaching & Induction to talk to a principal about work that was needed to be done in a school to improve relations with teachers.

Mrs. Good indicated her colleagues were talking about the teacher and the disconnect. She believed there was value in what they said as to leaving what was in place before in order to provide more balance for the teachers.

Mrs. Rupert explained the position of the previous Chief Talent Development Officer was not replaced in the new chart. The Director of Leadership Development was currently the acting person for the position.

Daniel Gohl, Chief Academics Officer, commented that this change would not dismantle anything. He said it was an important re-alignment in order to bring the neutrality in the questions by the Board.

Mrs. Bartleman supported eliminating the silos and suggested placing Talent Development under Academics instead of OSPA, which takes it away from the line of principals, and connects everything together, thereby eliminating multiple silos.

Dr. Osgood inquired how to ensure all teachers take certain trainings.

Mr. Gohl responded the perception was that certain schools could opt out of what was done for everyone. He and the Chief of OSPA had spent a lot of time modifying procedures to ensure both departments were aligned. He stated there could not be a separate professional development process outside of the practice; it all had to be connected together. The process for moving forward had to be defined for Broward County as a whole. In order to do better by the children, they would need to organize the stat so the intentions (Academics) and implementations (OSPA) align, and that was what they were trying to do.

Mrs. Brinkworth questioned if the new directors would be utilized as an intern pool of candidates that would come in to interview.

Dr. Wanza replied the job description did not require an individual to have gone through a preparation program to become a director; however, those individuals that have gone through a preparation program or were qualified may apply for the position.

Mrs. Brinkworth asked if it was a stipulation of the Wallace Foundation for the interns that had already come through the program.

Dr. Wanza said no, there was not a stipulation for the interns; however, there was a stipulation that the funds could only be used for Cadre Director positions.

Page 4

Ms. Korn was concerned with the connection with Early Learning and Bilingual/ESOL, which was K-12, and literacy that seemed to be carved out and should be all-encompassing. She said it felt as if literacy was supposed to be the core, but it seemed to be more segregated from everything.

Mr. Gohl acknowledged he may have mislabeled some things and could have worded it differently. Literacy is a Pre-K through 12 initiative and so was English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL). In looking at performance, there were students at the third grade level that were not proficient and failing the tenth grade Florida Standards Assessment (FSA). He said if Broward wants every student to be English proficient and multi-lingual, it would have to tie in dual language programs, among other things. It was a secondary problem, which needed to be redefined as to what was being done at the middle school and high school reading classes, which were not being impactful. Mr. Gohl believed ESOL and literacy were the key to this problem. Students were not able to engage in language sufficiently to do well on the test; however, even if they knew the material, the literacy levels needed to be improved. He was standing by the recommendation to connect second language acquisition with literacy acquisition and to do it early.

Ms. Korn stated staff covered a lot on bilingual and ESOL, but she wanted to know where the Pre-K made that direct connection.

Mr. Gohl responded one of the biggest challenges in Exceptional Student Education (ESE) and ESOL was what happened early. That must be identified early in order to make a difference. By having a common language and grouping these three groups together, would lead to the answer and accomplish that task.

Ms. Korn said she would need to be convinced through the practice and end results.

Mrs. Rupert inquired if there were any vacancies on page 4.

Mr. Gohl replied he was not aware of any vacancies for this group on page 4.

Mr. Runcie said HR would be better suited to answer questions on vacancies and asked staff to verify and get back to the Board.

Mrs. Rupert expressed a concern in working across the areas for isolating literacy. It was known that literacy needs to move across all curriculum. She knew there was a reason the Literacy department was on the other page previously, but wanted to know how that department felt about being separated from the other aspects of the curriculum to this page.

Mr. Gohl responded after he came to the District, he brought forth a proposal to ask people what they thought about the separation of literacy as a skill and life experience to be able to describe their world as a language. English Language Arts (ELA) was tested; whereas, literacy was something that needed to be lived. Unless students have a vocabulary to express what they live and experience, they are not able to begin the ELA curriculum.

Mrs. Rupert asked staff for a memorandum on how the Director of Literacy would be reaching across all areas and working across all contents. In addition, staff was to provide the thought process for the recommendations on this page, as well as what other districts were doing this, what was their data, and how it had worked for them.

Mrs. Brinkworth had similar concerns and stated under the Director of Literacy, it only spoke to school readiness. A double dose of reading in middle school was not making the student like it any more or perform any better. The District needs to review this in order to rectify it as soon as possible.

Mrs. Bartleman stated the biggest problem for children to overcome was vocabulary, which was included across the curriculum. She inquired how the science and social studies vocabulary would be tied in at the middle and high school levels.

Mr. Gohl replied unless students can kick back the vocabulary in context with peers and teachers and providing feedback, they are not able to make progress. He said vocabulary, context, and dialog were needed as part of the natural process of grades that go into assignments and show up on report cards. Mr. Gohl indicated he was trying to advocate what level a student would be after becoming an independent reader.

Mrs. Bartleman asked how was staff going to cross-train the content area teachers. A good reading teacher will employ the reading strategy across all content areas for that week because it is not in isolation.

Dr. Wanza responded they would look at the content area teachers at the secondary level and go back to the training and strategies from several years ago, in particular reading and English.

Mr. Gohl added they needed to have common protocols, regardless of content discipline and how vocabulary was pushed. The Board approved a contract for Vocabulary.com, which was one of many tools being laid out to explicitly challenge students to increase their vocabulary. He said students need to take pride in their ability to use language, with feedback being provided to let them know if they were able to use language well.

Eric Chisem, Director, Talent Acquisition & Operations, clarified the two positions on page 4 were no longer vacant; however, there was one position for School Readiness that would be provided should the grant funding come through next year.

Mrs. Rupert suggested deleting the box to the right, Curriculum Supervisor for School Readiness, with the one, grant-funded, position if the funding was not currently available.

Mrs. Good did not understand why having an Executive Director in between the Chief and the Directors would further strengthen the area or create greater opportunities. In addition, she wanted to know why it was important to have the Director of Bilingual/ESOL being placed under a position that was more in tune with early learning than it was with the language aspect.

Mr. Gohl responded an Executive Director was needed when there is a role to play on the area focus for the county as a whole. This was necessary because it warranted additional coordination and leadership in terms of dual language and language interventions.

Mrs. Good asked what was the benefit of bringing in under the Executive Director the whole arm of language and ESOL.

Mr. Gohl explained there were many students coming to the District that struggled with reading. People needed to be trained in language acquisition to differentiate between learning disabilities and learning delays, both in Pre-K and adolescents.

Mrs. Good stated, having been an ESOL student herself, there could be a litany of different issues students struggled with coming from a different country and not understanding the language. She felt this could have fallen under a variety of places on these pages of the Org. Chart. She did not understand why this segment was only being placed under this Executive Director. Mrs. Good understood why the early learning, Volunteer Pre-Kindergarten (VPK), and literacy were on the chart, but did not see the value or follow how this branch fit it. This was an area that has flourished and worked well, so she did not see it as an area that would benefit from any additional oversight.

Mr. Gohl did not see it as additional oversight because he felt oversight was additional support. He said right now 36% of students came from households where another language other than English was spoken. Based on demographic material for the next five (5) years, that number was expected to go up to 42%, given the number of births in the last 12 months, and the trend had that number going over 50%. There were 27% of families on public assistance and that number was expected to rise to 47% given the current demographic statistics.

Mr. Gohl said the District needed to set up its system today to deal with the students that come tomorrow. This was the right mix of early learning, language acquisition/literacy, and second language services.

Mrs. Good commented if there were opportunities to address some of the points staff made and if the departments could be brought together without adding an additional layer or financial impact, she thought it should be done.

Ms. Murray had a different viewpoint on the Executive Director. She said although this position was being re-purposed from Instruction & Interventions, 70% of the money was from grants. She asked how long the money would last and what was the cost difference from the general budget for the higher position.

Mr. Gohl replied the grant money would last for some time. The amount coming from the general budget would have a negligible impact.

Ms. Murray stated she had all but two (2) Title I schools in her district. She had three (3) elementary schools that were dual-language and two of the schools have had the program for four (4) years. She said both schools advanced in reading scores, which meant the program was working. The success rate in the middle and high schools has been dismal, simply because the desire to read had not been implanted in the students. Ms. Murray believed it was the individuals and not the program, that makes the difference. She indicated she supported this because the scope of the job was so large. A child could be taught to read at any level but the comprehension is the issue. She emphasized early childhood learning and ESE were the critical areas and where the effort was necessitated most. Ms. Murray stressed if they were not provided for, the middle and high school students would continue to struggle. She believed it would be helpful if the Board knew the answer as to how long the grant would last and if the costs could be absorbed.

Mrs. Rich Levinson commented that there was no need for another upper level position. There were three (3) very strong Directors and she would rather put the resources in the schools. If necessary, the Executive Director should be moved to page 6 where there were eight (8) direct reports, but definitely should not be placed with the three (3) on this page. She did not feel any of the added Executive Directors listed on the Org. Chart were needed and reiterated that those resources should go to the schools. In addition, she believed ESOL should be placed on page 6 and felt it fell in line with everything else on that page.

Mrs. Brinkworth wanted to know how an induction coach is perceived by a principal or administrator's point of view. There needed to be a certain level of synergy and expectation between the departments and Directors and she did not think that would be achieved by adding a layer of upper level management.

Mrs. Rupert said she would be in agreement with her colleague to move the Executive Director to page 6.

Ms. Korn was in agreement that there were three (3) strong Directors and an Executive Director was not needed.

Mrs. Good asked the Superintendent to provide his thoughts. She stated if the Executive Director was a re-purposed position with a person, how would the Board go about eliminating the position without eliminating the person.

Mr. Runcie understood the consensus to eliminate the Executive Director position and made note of it. He asked if he could have some time to discuss with staff after they have reviewed the rest of the recommendations and bring a resolution to the Board for consideration.

Page 5

Mrs. Rupert asked for confirmation that the vacancies were intended to be filled, to which staff replied yes.

Mrs. Bartleman wanted to go on record that she disagreed with the ESE structure and did not feel the services had improved.

Page 6

Mrs. Rupert disagreed with moving the Director and team of Professional Standards & Support out of Talent Development, as well as the Director and team of Teacher Professional Learning & Growth. Also, she did not understand why the Supervisor of Professional Development Standards & Support was eliminated but the costs went up.

Mr. Moquin replied in the response he was working off of Exhibit 1; however, the Agenda Request Form (ARF) accurately reflected the financial impact. He stated he would update the Exhibit, but that it actually referred to a position on page 7, which was the Grants Administrator Specialist.

Mrs. Rupert referred to the Executive Director of Instruction & Interventions and the Director of Strategic Achievement and asked staff to ensure those responsibilities were taken over when re-purposed. She told staff she would be interested to see a flow chart of responsibilities.

Mrs. Rich Levinson was thrilled with the Applied Learning Director and the line of reports. She did not understand why the gifted was under Innovative Learning and felt it should be in a box under Elementary and Secondary, with a box in the middle of the two categories. She believed it was not connected with any curriculum being isolated in a category by itself.

Mr. Gohl responded the importance of advanced academics should be to move students up faster when they are ready; however, students could do that by being gifted. He said not all gifted students need to go faster. Mr. Gohl wanted to focus on gifted students, in which some needed to go sideways or deeper and not always faster. It was about how to engage the students. He did not want to treat gifted as just a curriculum. The only way the gifted program was being measured was by how fast the students were being pushed. He believed this was the best area for it to be placed.

Mrs. Rich Levinson understood but said when it came to implementing it in the classroom, it would not matter where it went as long as it was implemented. There were other ways to measure the gifted program besides how fast students were being pushed, but the District has not done so. She said she would wait to see what happened with it as a practice and what was being done in the classroom, and let it fall where it may. Mrs. Rich Levinson commented as with gifted, the Board could discuss where certain categories should fall, but until real change had been implemented into the classroom, the conversation would just go in circles. She suggested that the Superintendent take the \$920,000 from the general fund out and come back to the Board.

Mr. Moquin replied the \$920,000 was grant funded.

Mrs. Rich Levinson said every year it was the same thing and it increased at the higher level. It did not matter where the money was coming from; she believed the dollars could be used for something else in the classroom. She reiterated the \$920,000 should be cut and she did not think the District was in a position to add more high level positions.

Mrs. Freedman inquired how many years the three (3) Cadre Directors were being funded through the grant.

Dr. Wanza said two (2) years. If the District should decide to keep the positions, they would look at other grant dollars to continue the funding.

Mr. Moquin added that during the course of the two (2) years, evaluation mechanisms would be developed to determine the actual impact of these three (3) positions before making a decision at the end of the grant funding.

Mrs. Brinkworth requested information on the STEM+C and Humanities positions under the Director of Applied Learning.

Mr. Gohl responded there was a great deal of work that was under-supported. He said principals did not have a way to support things that were not tested. These positions were repurposed from below the line that were now being brought above the line. Performance-based assessment in the performance arts and professional development world, merged with debate, coding, robotics, and STEM, was where he believed education was heading in the next 5-10 years.

Mrs. Brinkworth appreciated where it was being placed to make it known that these were the priorities and the direction in moving forward. She wanted to ensure that those individuals were empowered to make sure those things were happening and being implemented.

Page 7

Mrs. Rich Levinson did not understand why a Supervisor was being added for College & Career Readiness. She would rather have more resources going to the schools and believed everyone should be working for College & Career Readiness.

Mr. Gohl agreed but said given where the District was today, the way it had been working in the past had not moved the District to that point. He indicated there would be an update to the Strategic Plan in June. The callout that all students were college and career ready was an explicit piece. It would take a greater degree of coordination to ensure all students were getting it and these were the resources. Counselors that were at a 400-600:1 ratio needed not just more counselors, but they needed better direction as to what they should do. He believed this would generate a significant return on investment.

Mrs. Rich Levinson asked what this person would be doing differently.

Mr. Gohl replied the Director would provide explicit direction to principals working with OSPA, as well as counselors and counselors' / guidance staff as to how they should be structuring the guidance for their schools, which was currently not occurring at a supervisory level. In addition, they need to monitor the preparedness of students beginning no later than sixth grade as to whether or not they were on track, and what was being done by school to ensure all students were on track.

Mrs. Rich Levinson stated that was something that should be done at the schools and not by another position.

Mrs. Bartleman commented a huge investment was made in Naviance and not having the staff or people to get it out was wasting the District's money. There were some people who were not aware it existed. She expressed her frustration over purchased items that were not being used.

Page 8

Mrs. Bartleman conveyed her desire to have a solid line from the Chief Auditor to the Board.

Mrs. Rupert concurred and inquired if a Construction Auditor was needed.

Mr. Runcie replied they have engaged McGladrey on a number of levels to review work, as well as help to bring some accountability to contractors or Owners Representatives and Cost Control Manager to ensure the contracts were being performed to the expectations and performance standards in place. He said there was a lot of oversight going on in Facilities at this point.

Mr. Bobadilla added that he had a couple meetings with McGladrey who was creating a scope of work of things that they were engaged in. He had also met with Adkins to see how they could further leverage the cost control services that were being provided. He stated that having these entities to work with would provide better oversight, as well as the ability for the entire operation to pick up on good business practices moving forward. He intended to have McGladrey continue to be involved with the work being conducted.

Mrs. Good said during a recent workshop, the Chief Auditor mentioned he had someone overseeing the Facilities side and there was discussion as to whether or not he needed an additional person and wanted to know if that was still the case. In addition, she wanted to know his thoughts on reporting directly to the Board.

Mr. Moquin reminded the Board that last year, because of the additional support by McGladrey providing oversight to the Facilities side, they had the opportunity to reallocate one Facility Audit position to provide additional resources to the operational audit side without any additional cost because of the external oversight by McGladrey.

Patrick Reilly, Chief Auditor, responded last year they moved one of their Facility Auditors to the operational audit. In regards to the construction side, they only had one person and he felt it would be good to have some more internal staff. He said they have used McGladrey for a few things regarding some closeout audits, but nothing moving forward so far with the bond. He reiterated the need for additional staff for other areas. Mr. Reilly and the Chief of Staff spoke a few months ago about possibly adding a couple of Auditor IIIs that were below the line on the Org. Chart that could assist with the need. The two groups that would need assistance with additional staff would be Charters and Facilities. Concerning the Chief Auditor reporting to the Board, although the current procedure has been productive, he believed the reporting process could work either way.

Mrs. Good would be supportive of adding at least one Auditor III and believed it would assist the District as a whole. In addition, she concurred with her colleagues and would not be opposed to having a direct link between the Chief Auditor and the School Board.

Mrs. Rich Levinson said in listening to the comments from the Chief Auditor, she did not hear that there was anything wrong with the current reporting. She was not sure why the topic kept coming up and indicated the Board receives a copy of all the audits and did not see any problems in the way they were presented to the Board. Mrs. Rich Levinson conveyed she thought this should wait for discussion until a decision on the Inspector General (IG) was made.

Mrs. Bartleman believed it should be changed right away because the Chief Auditor should be auditing and reporting to the Superintendent, who was his direct supervisor. She opined that the Chief Auditor was the Board's auditor, it was his job to find operational issues, the Board was responsible for approving his auditing plan, and she did not think he should be auditing his boss.

Mrs. Brinkworth agreed with her colleague as to waiting until the Board had the discussion about the IG before deciding to whom the Chief Auditor should report and have just one comprehensive conversation.

Dr. Osgood agreed and would like to have an additional discussion that included the communities and committees and what impact, if any, would occur from any changes made.

Mr. Runcie agreed to add another Auditor III for support. As time goes on, they could revisit whether or not any additional auditors were needed.

Mrs. Good requested that consideration be given for adjustments to be made today on certain pages where possible as requested by the Board.

Page 9

Mrs. Rupert questioned if the Executive Director for Capital Programs position was still needed since it had been vacant for almost a year. She also asked if there were still 12 vacancies because the list provided to her indicated there were less. In reference to the unfilled vacancies that stood this year, she inquired how many were filled, how many were still needed, and what would the department look like with the vacancies filled, along with the Program Managers and Directors, without adding any more layers of administration. She suggested removing the Executive Director and re-evaluating this department further for needed cost savings on efficiencies. In addition, she wanted to know how the plan would fit with the money used for cost analysis or Cost Control Program Manager and Total Program Control Manager.

Mr. Runcie replied the positions on the chart were created this time last year and the rationale was discussed with the Board. Some of the positions were filled, but a halt was put on others until the new Chief Facilities Officer was hired. Since then, they worked aggressively to fill the positions.

Leo Bobadilla, Chief Facilities Officer, added that no layers had been added and the Executive Director was a role that was already in place. He believed that position would be important in regards to the bond in order to be successful. He mentioned that Orange County had a Senior Executive Director and Miami-Dade had Executive Directors, as did other smaller school districts in Florida.

Mrs. Rupert believed the Board was sold on the Project Managers and cost analysis people to handle the aspect of performance improvement from Heery who were being paid \$16 million to handle the work. She felt another layer was being added because no one had been in that seat for over a year.

Mr. Bobadilla responded there were two Project Manager III positions being eliminated to save money.

Mr. Moquin pointed out that all 12 vacant positions were not from last year's added positions; some of the vacancies were new.

Mrs. Rupert stated she was going by the 2015-2016 Org. Chart and comparing to the current one being proposed. She wanted to see the positions that were Director and below, filled efficiently with people before an Executive Director position was filled that had been vacant for a year. She believed if the department was fully staffed, it would be able to function without needing the Executive Director position.

Mrs. Good agreed with her colleague to ensure the vacant positions were filled. In addition, the Directors needed to be accountable and empowered, and could only do so by having a full staff. She also agreed that the Executive Director should not be considered.

Mrs. Brinkworth commented that she had the same concerns, in addition to having so many vacant spots for a year. She agreed that Heery and Adkins had been hired at a great expense to the District to perform certain functions. She did not think at this time, this was the best use of resources when the resources were so limited and she was also not supportive of the Executive Director.

Mrs. Rich Levinson concurred. She was not supportive of any of the three (3) Executive Director positions but did support the Physical Plan Operation (PPO) Finance wholeheartedly. In regards to secretaries, she would like to see them shared in the future as it is done in the private sector. She did not want any secretaries cut, but as positions are added she did not want to see secretarial positions added as well.

Page 11

Mrs. Rupert inquired why the Director of Employee & Labor Relations needed two Specialists of Investigations reporting to her. She asked staff to clarify the job description for the Specialists of Investigations. The reporting structure stated the position should report to the Director of Internal Investigations, but the Org. Chart showed it reporting to the Director of Employee & Labor Relations; there was no Director of Internal Investigations.

Craig Nichols, Chief Human Resources & Equity Officer, replied the job description he was looking at that was approved last year for Specialist of Professional Standards, which was what the position was for, stated that the position reported to the Chief of Staff.

Mr. Moquin added that there was no Director of Internal Investigations. The exhibit of job descriptions reflected how it was previously going to be presented. He said the revised job descriptions would be brought forward in June.

Mrs. Rupert did not agree with Employee Evaluations being moved to this page and felt it should be in Talent Development.

Mrs. Brinkworth asked staff to clarify that the Specialist of Professional Standards was moving from the Chief of Staff to this page, to which staff answered yes.

Page 12

Mrs. Rich Levinson did not think the Information Technology Manager should be changed to a Director.

Tony Hunter, Chief Information Officer, said alignments had taken place due to several functions happening in multiple divisions, which created silos in terms of the way they worked. First and foremost, the Director of Computer Operations used to have all of the records retentions functions under its division. He indicated the records retention area, as well as the bond and E-Rate functionality requirements, were now added under the Director of Finance position.

Mrs. Rich Levinson conveyed that she still did not see the reason for this position. She stated staff needed to be cognizant in moving Managers into Director positions. She did not feel that having increased responsibilities rose to the level of being placed in a higher position and said the work could be spread out differently if necessary.

Mrs. Rupert referred to the Director of Information Security and said she would not be supporting it. She felt a more fiscal and responsible move would be to add a third Manager to Information Security.

Mrs. Good concurred in regards to the Director of Information Technology Finance being able to function in a Manager role. She stated she would be able to support the Director of Information Security because of the security breach issue.

Page 13

Ms. Murray inquired how the position would be funded.

Leslie Brown, Chief Portfolio Services Officer, responded the position would be supported through the collection of administration fees from Charter schools.

Mrs. Rich Levinson thought the administration fees did not cover all the services provided by the District.

Mrs. Brown replied an analysis was done about four (4) years ago. The analysis would be done again this summer and would also be included in the legislative platform to see if administrative fees could be increased. The past year with administrative fees provided resources for one curriculum person.

Mrs. Rich Levinson did not think it would necessarily, if the resources were going toward things already being done. She felt the analysis should have come before this request. She believed the process was being done in reverse order and she would have first liked to have seen where the administration fees were presently being distributed.

Mr. Runcie stated he would have staff prepare a breakdown for the Board. There were a lot of challenges with some of the Charter schools and to the extent that more resources could be added to minimize the financial exposure when they close or terminate, it would pay for itself.

Mrs. Rich Levinson asked staff how this position would help and what effect it would have by adding it.

Jody Perry, Director, Charter Schools, replied she had one person doing literacy compliance reviews for Charter schools, K-12 levels, including course recovery. That position was responsible for seeing that Charters were providing reading plans with fidelity of implementation. There was a change in Charter law so now, whether or not Charters opt in on the reading plan, they would receive the reading allocation directly to them.

Ms. Perry explained her department had seen an increase of Charter schools opting out of reading plans, which required her to have staff review their reading plans, see if it met the same level of structure that the District plan reviews, and then her only staff person for Literacy would go out to the schools to determine if the Charter schools were implementing their own plan. She said she was requesting more hands-on-deck to ensure the students at the Charter schools were receiving what they were entitled to, especially in the area of literacy.

Mrs. Rich Levinson stated this was for the new law and asked what would happen if the Charter schools did not use the District's reading plan.

Ms. Perry answered that they would not receive the funding.

Mrs. Rich Levinson believed it was a good reason to add this position due to the change in law and to allow staff to monitor the Charter schools more closely. She also believed this process should be put on the District's legislative platform.

Page 15

Mrs. Rupert suggested moving the two Specialists of Professional Standards on page 11 to this page under Personnel Administrator of Professional Standards. In previous years, that position oversaw nine (9) Special Investigative Unit (SIU) investigators. She also wanted to advocate for the three (3) Gang Prevention Coordinators, as well as having all sworn police officers staffed, which was 18 plus the Major and Chief. If there was not a consensus for that, she would need to know from staff how all the work would be disbursed with fidelity.

Mr. Moquin responded that the reason why the two Professional Standards positions were moved was to keep a clear separation between SIU doing things as it related to Policy 4.9; opposed to what should be handled in the schools. The work that the Gang Prevention Coordinators did was done at the schools. This would provide an opportunity to transition them into two sworn officers and provide more flexibility, as well as help schools oversee the drills.

Mr. Nichols added when the Specialist positions were identified, they were built to serve a gap and fit well in HR. They were intended to be more preventative and help support administrators in schools dealing with employee issues through progressive discipline before it turned into Policy 4.9 investigations.

Mrs. Rupert asked staff if they thought it should not be under Personnel Administrator for Professional Standards and instead under Employee & Labor Relations.

Mr. Nichols answered in the affirmative.

Mr. Moquin agreed and said the individual in that position supported the Chief and Major and dealing with the investigation process in trying to coordinate with the investigators in terms of the status of certain cases. He did not think the title was what was confusing as to why the two resources should be on this page.

Mrs. Rupert reiterated she would need to know from staff how all the work would be disbursed because she felt they could barely handle what they could do when there were three (3) and now it was being reduced to one (1).

Mr. Moquin replied it was a redistribution of responsibilities to leverage the sworn officer that already existed at the majority of schools, but he would work with staff to distribute the responsibilities to the school team.

Mr. Runcie agreed and said they had a very pointed conversation with the detectives and leadership within the department, and they felt it was appropriate and made more sense to redistribute those responsibilities among the detectives in the department. He indicated they would work with the school team and OSPA to have School Resource Officers (SROs) more involved.

Ms. Murray provided a little history in gang prevention where there was a federal program 10-12 years ago that established a five-year program for gang prevention that no longer exists. Since then, there have been many programs started through various departments. Her concern was that there were not enough SIUs and investigators in the department and would like the Superintendent to have that re-evaluated.

Mrs. Brinkworth understood the Chief of Staff and requested that the name be changed to School Safety. She believed school safety was the most important thing to take place. She said the job of the three individuals doing the job needed to be reviewed to ensure that job continued to happen at the same or higher level. She asked staff to explain what the difference was between the SIU Detective positions falling under Schools versus Personnel.

Mr. Moquin responded the nine (9) Detectives/Personnel they focused primarily on investigations. There was a clear vie between responsibilities for Personnel Investigations under Policy 4.9 and the work being done under first responder to schools. The thought after talking to representatives was that they wanted to go back to that, realizing they could always draw resources from either end based on the volume of work and the need.

Mrs. Brinkworth encouraged staff to have a conversation with both the current and retired Gang Prevention Coordinators ensure whatever was being done would be encompassed with what was done before at the same or higher level. She thanked staff for meeting with some of the existing police department members to discuss a way to structure this that made sense for the people involved in the work and those with the greatest knowledge of the work. Mrs. Brinkworth wanted to know how things were being handled in the interim, such as when an investigation was brought forward, where would it go.

Mr. Nichols replied the Personnel of Professional Standards was the person handling the flow and was currently in that role now and had been for many years. That person also handled the work flow in the caseload process.

Mr. Moquin added that under Policy 4.9, it was the Chief of Police/SIU that would have the authority to accept or approve an investigation. The Personnel administrator helps facilitate the incoming complaints from schools. It was a collaborative effort with the ultimate individual who had the authority to approve the investigation moving forward as the Interim Chief of Police.

Mr. Runcie asked the Chief of Staff to get the process documented in writing in order to provide a trail of who does what if they needed to be contacted.

Mrs. Good thanked the Superintendent, the Chief of Staff, and the Chief Human Resource & Equity Officer.

Mrs. Bartleman inquired how the Personnel Administrator worked with the Specialists of Investigations and if the positions were vacant.

Mr. Moquin responded those were existing positions and currently vacant. He said any issues to come through that did not rise to the level of Policy 4.9 and needed to be dealt with at the school level, would be coordinated back through Employee Relations and school-based administration.

Mrs. Bartleman asked why two positions were needed in HR if it were determined the issue did not have to go to an investigation.

Mr. Nichols replied not everything would go from SIU back to these Specialists. As the administrators at schools have needs, they would also reach out to the Specialists for support, help, and guidance on employee issues and progressive discipline.

Mrs. Bartleman did not feel the positions were needed if they were just going to be used to kick back cases that did not go to SIU.

Mr. Nichols responded the intake would not just come from SIU but rather from administrators at schools.

Mrs. Bartleman questioned if the Specialists of Investigations, who had less of a degree, did not have certification, school law, or police experience, would be contacted for help.

Mr. Nichols stated there were Specialists in the workplace, Employee Relations, Investigations, and Professional Standards, and come from many different backgrounds. He explained the job description that was approved last year set the minimum threshold and did not mean that someone could not be a certified educator. He said many of the investigators were educators.

Mrs. Bartleman said in reading the job description anyone could basically fill the position based on preferred qualifications and experience. She indicated she was not going to approve the two positions and would vote "no" on the Org. Chart if necessary. She suggested using the money to hire secretaries for that department to type the cases/transcripts.

Mrs. Rupert remarked she felt the job description was very weak and she had already marked up her changes for when it comes back. She stated those changes as being under Minimum Qualifications, instead of 6-10 years, she wanted 8-12 years; under Preferred Qualifications, instead of 4-8 years, she wanted 6-10 years; a degree major in Personnel Administration, HR; and she would be amenable to Educational Leadership.

Mrs. Bartleman was trying to understand the structure. This was about documenting someone's performance or lack thereof, because it did not rise to the level of SIU. She felt the Cadre Director should be able to direct principals how to do that and did not understand how it would help by having these two positions added.

Dr. Osgood stated most of the Board was comfortable with having the two positions, but she wanted the rest of the comments to be made by other Board members.

Mrs. Good inquired what the Cadre's role would be and how would it be different than involving a Specialist.

Mr. Runcie replied a Cadre Director would not be involved in school administrative activities or responsible for discipline matters.

Mr. Moquin added the original intent of the Specialists was to provide a level of support on process and trying to take some of the administrative burden off principals for issues and disciplinary reviews being pushed down to the school level. It was particularly for the ones that would rise to the level where the discipline would probably include some type of a suspension or termination and there was a potential for a Division of Administrative Hearing (DOAH) case. The representative for the principals was very supportive of the positions because it was a necessary resource that the principals needed and did not have it.

Mrs. Good commented she had also heard that principals were being swamped with these types of situations and were supportive of having this type of support. She believed resources for the "below the line" positions were very important and asked staff to elaborate on the comments made by her colleague.

Mr. Moquin responded he had started to meet with staff to discuss the burden of the work in the "hopper" with the clerical preparation of the cases became problematic under a previous Chief who wanted all the statements transcribed, which was not part of the past practices. He said in listening to the feedback from the staff that had been in the department for many years, was if that could be re-visited again recognizing the importance and, depending on the magnitude of the case or once an employee had the intent to file an appeal, at that point in working with Administrative Counsel, to then go ahead and complete a transcript of all the statements.

Mr. Moquin's commitment to the staff was that he would speak to Legal to see about the feasibility. His take-away from his conversations with staff was just that one shift would do a lot to alleviate the administrative burden associated with the preparation of the cases. He had also asked for a current situation where the vacancies were needed so they could be expeditiously filled.

Mrs. Good asked if the positions for Specialists of Investigations on page 11 were supportive by the principals' group.

Mr. Moquin answered absolutely and that the principals had spoken at the workshop in favor of it.

Mr. Nichols added that this role was very typical for people in management because they would not necessarily deal with employee issues all the time. Having someone on staff who was learned and able to support would help principals, APs, and others address a lot of the issues. He stated that many in management tend to shy away from addressing issues when they were not comfortable with them or felt they did not have the support.

Mrs. Good was supportive of this and looked forward to the job descriptions coming back to the Board.

Mrs. Brinkworth also looked forward to the job descriptions and hoped to have them soon.

Mrs. Rupert inquired if staff was able to meet with the Gang Prevention Coordinator.

Mr. Moquin said no.

Mrs. Rupert asked what would be the process to do so.

Mr. Moquin replied as he had become more involved with SIU, his commitment was to spend more dedicated time in the department hands-on in terms of continuing the work through the foundation that had already been laid. He would continue to ensure it gets implemented appropriately and to facilitate and provide additional leadership until the new leadership is in place. The title for the Gang Prevention Coordinator would be changing and he planned to meet with the individual, as well as the retired Gang Prevention Coordinator, so when he returned at the next meeting with the new title change, he would have a more thoughtful layout of how those roles would be incorporated within the school SIU detective team.

Mrs. Freedman did not feel the Chief needed to be a sworn officer as opposed to having the managerial experience and being able to delegate the responsibilities to the different sworn officers.

Mr. Nichols commented duly noted. He said they have the advertisement ready to launch in the search for the Chief of SIU. The key part added was emphasized that the person had to have that experience because administratively the person would be handling a very large department doing a lot of different things and not just the detectives.

Mr. Moquin added that they were cognizant of understanding the skillset qualifications of the next Chief would need to support a strong background in administration and management. To the extent that they may not be able to source the right person under the existing job description, they could potentially go back and review what Mrs. Freedman discussed.

Page 16

Mrs. Rupert said her comments from page 12 were the same for this page regarding adding layers and vacancy count. She asked staff how many vacancies there were currently.

Maurice Woods, Chief Strategy & Operations Officer, responded there were four (4); two (2) on pages 16 and 17. There was one Business Analyst listed on page 16 that was a new position and was incorrectly added to the list in Exhibit 3.

Mrs. Rupert recommended removing the new position of Executive Director, Strategic Management, as well as the Director of Enterprise Project Management (EPM). She would like to fully re-align and staff the existing people first before moving to the Executive Director position.

Mrs. Rich Levinson supported the Evaluation position but not the Executive Director. She also supported the Purchasing positions on page 17 and hoped that return on investment would pay off by having the right people and the right seats on the bus. She referred back to the Chief Academic Officer (CAO) on page 4 and said many Board members were uncomfortable with ESOL having an Executive Director. She proposed placing the Pre-K programs, the Literacy, and the Elementary Learning with an Executive Director. It would basically be aligning Pre-K through sixth in an area with an Executive Director and would still have three (3) reports and would solve the ESOL problem as well.

Mr. Runcie asked if they could take a short break so he could discuss all the suggestions with senior staff while the Assistant General Counsel returned to the Board with an update from the Closed Door held earlier.

Mrs. Good agreed with her colleague's suggestion and asked the Superintendent to consider in his discussion eliminating all the Executive Director positions to save dollars. In addition, because the CEO of Broward Education Foundation (BEF) was no longer being funded by the District, she also requested that a dash line be added from BEF to the Chief Strategy & Operations Officer on page 16.

Dr. Osgood asked that the Talent Development piece be discussed as well with staff and bring back with the other positions.

Following input from the audience, the Chair announced the Superintendent and senior staff would take a break to discuss the proposed changes to the Org. Chart, while the Board met for an update on the previously held Closed Door Session.

Mr. Runcie indicated he and staff took into great consideration the comments provided by the Board earlier. He said they tried to balance it out based on what they knew were the needs of the organization and being able to execute the work in front of them. He stated the Chief of Staff would review the adjustments they made, page-by-page, and the financial implications would be given as well.

Mr. Moquin referred to pages 2 and 3 and said they would be left as is and there would be no changes made. On page 4, the Director of Bilingual/ESOL would be moved to page 6 and report to the CAO; the Director of Early Learning & School Readiness would move down with the two (2) Curriculum Supervisors of School Readiness under it reporting to that individual; and the Director of Literacy remain on this page. Due to concern of the span of control, if only those changes were made it would increase the number of direct reports from 11 to 13. As a result of some other changes, they recommended the Executive Director of Instruction & Interventions position be re-purposed on to this page as an Executive Director of Language Acquisition & Literacy Interventions, with a Director of Head Start and Early Learning reporting to it, the Director of Early Learning & School Readiness, as well as the Director of Literacy.

Mr. Gohl added he was reluctant to place Elementary Learning under the Executive Director (ED) because of the state's standards and the way that Florida holds schools accountable. He believed it was important to have Elementary Learning focus on both the acquisition of primary and the intermediate 3-5 grades. To put this under the ED that was proposed, he did not think that would get it done. Mr. Gohl said in speaking to the Directors of Bilingual/ESOL and Early Learning, it was determined that the Bilingual/ESOL group could be separated from this Executive Director position. He stated Literacy and Early Learning needed additional focus, and by bringing resources to that was something he stood by. He indicated that they could work with 11 Directors by leaving the existing organizational structure as it appeared on paper and moving Bilingual/ESOL to page 6.

Mr. Runcie summarized the only change on page 4 would be to move the Director of Bilingual/ESOL and its team to page 6, who would then report to the CAO. The remaining two (2) Directors, Head Start and Literacy, would report to the Executive Director of Early Learning & School Readiness.

Mr. Moquin indicated there were no changes on page 5. On page 6, the only change would be the Director of Bilingual/ESOL moving over and reporting directly to the CAO. No changes were made to pages 7 and 8.

Mrs. Good asked if a commitment would be made on page 8 under "the line" to add an Auditor III.

Mr. Runcie replied yes.

Mr. Moquin referred to page 9 and stated the Executive Director was downgraded to Senior Director, Pay Band D. The consensus from the Board was not in support of the recommended change and believed additional layers of high level positions should not be added, especially when there were so many other vacancies in the department. In addition, there was also a consensus that Heery and Adkins were hired to oversee the projects.

Mr. Runcie suggested that staff fill the other vacancies and come back to the Board for this position at a later time after monitoring the need.

Mr. Moquin stated there would be no changes on pages 10 and 11. Referring to page 12, he said they would no longer re-align the Manager of Finance to be a Director and it would be left as a Manager position, but asked that a job study be conducted.

Mr. Runcie confirmed that this position would return to a Manager position but without a job study.

Mr. Moquin indicated pages 13-15 had no changes. On page 16, the new Executive Director of Strategy Implementation & Accountability would be eliminated. In addition, instead of re-classifying the current Executive Director to Enterprise Project Management, they would re-align it to oversee the Directors of Performance Management and Program Evaluation. He said page 17 would have no changes as well.

In closing, Mr. Moquin shared the net affect in what they brought back, combined with the additional concessions made by the Superintendent, was an overall impact to the General Fund in a savings of over \$185,614. The new financial impact overall, was approximately \$444,000, which reflected an approximate \$477,000 savings from the \$920,561 that was proposed to the Board this morning. He then went over what would be appropriate motions for the Board to make in order to amend this item.

Motion to Amend (Carried)

Motion was made by Mrs. Good, seconded by Mrs. Rupert and carried, to amend the Organizational Chart, page 4, to move the Director of Bilingual/ESOL, as well as the staff that reports up to them, back to page 6, reporting directly to the Chief Academic Officer. In addition, the Curriculum Supervisor, School Readiness, that was currently grant funded, be reflected as eliminated with an "X" on it. Mrs. Bartleman, Mrs. Freedman, and Ms. Korn were absent for the vote. (6-0 vote)

A vote was taken on the Motion to Amend.

Second Motion to Amend (Carried)

Motion was made by Mrs. Good, seconded by Ms. Murray and carried, to amend the Organizational Chart, page 9, to eliminate the current Executive Director of Capital Programs & PPO. Mrs. Bartleman, Mrs. Freedman, and Ms. Korn were absent for the vote. (6-0 vote)

A vote was taken on the Second Motion to Amend.

Third Motion to Amend (Carried)

Motion was made by Mrs. Good, seconded by Ms. Murray and carried, to amend the Organizational Chart, page 12, to return the Director of Finance back to a Manager of Finance, Pay Band "C." Mrs. Bartleman, Mrs. Freedman, and Ms. Korn were absent for the vote. (6-0 vote)

A vote was taken on the Third Motion to Amend.

Fourth Motion to Amend (Carried)

Motion was made by Ms. Murray, seconded by Mrs. Good and carried, to amend the Organizational Chart, page 16, eliminate the newly-proposed Executive Director of Strategy Implementation & Accountability; in lieu of reclassifying the current Executive Director of Strategy & Continuous Improvement to the Director of Enterprise Project Management, the position would be realigned to have the Directors of Performance Management and Program Evaluation report to that position; and to modify the solid line from the President/CEO of Broward Education Foundation to a dash line. Mrs. Bartleman, Mrs. Freedman, and Ms. Korn were absent for the vote. (6-0 vote)

A vote was taken on the Fourth Motion to Amend.

A vote was taken on this item as amended.

Adjournment This meeting was adjourned at 7:56 p.m.

/dvn