

09 06 2016 Work Session 12 30 PM

NEW BUSINESS

1. [12:30 - 1:00 PM School Board Comments](#)

Minutes:

Mrs. Sellers reminded the Board Members if they are interested in submitting any items for the Florida School Boards Association (FSBA) legislative platform, they must do so by Friday, September 9.

BOARD AGENDA REVIEW

2. [1:00 - 1:30 PM Review the Agenda for the September 6, 2016 School Board Meeting as REVISED](#)

Attachment: [09 06 16 School Board Meeting Agenda.pdf](#)

Minutes:

Item C-9 New administrators

Mr. Harris asked if the School District still requires a minimum of three years of in-class teaching experience before allowing staff members to enter the administrator pool.

Brian Warren, Senior Director of Human Resources, will get that information and return to the Board.

Item C-11 4th Quarter Disposition Report

Mr. Berryman asked how much money was received from the bus dispositions. He commented the financial summary seems to be very low. He reference the documentation indicating revenue of \$38,000 of all items. He stated even with some of the equipment being cannibalized it stands to reason the sale of buses should be higher than this figure. Rob Davis, Interim Associate Superintendent of Operations, stated the buses were posted on the GovDeals.com website. He does not have the financial information at this time but will return that information to the Board. They were "pusher" buses.

Item C-12 Resolutions to Amend District School Budget 2015-2016 (June 2016)

Mr. Wilson commented it appears this item had a negative impact on the District's fund balance. Mr. Perrone explained this is the final set of amendments to last school year's budget. These were all internal investments.

Item C-24 Purchase of Follett Destiny from Follett Corporation \$172,095.80

Mr. Wilson asked if this is already embedded in the current budget. Dr. Tina Barrios, Director of Information Technology, explained it is a recurring cost and is a part of the current budget.

Item C-26 FL Department of Education Required Annual Five Year Work Plan

Mr. Berryman asked why it appears the revenue falls off in 2018-2019. Mr. Davis explained it is due in-part to the loss of sales tax.

Item C-33 Theralinks - \$201, 480.00, ESE

Mr. Wilson asked if this expenditure is embedded in the current budget. John Small, Deputy Superintendent, explained it is in the Exceptional Student Education (ESE) budget. Mr. Berryman asked how many years the contract for. It is an annual contract.

Item C-39 Learning Resource Center Florida - Baptist Children's Home \$25,000, Title I

Mr. Wilson commented there was no budget impact analysis for this item. Carol Matthews, Internal Auditor, explained items under \$50,000 do not require a budget impact analysis.

Item R-41 Digital Classroom Plan 2016-2017, IST, \$2,360,436

Mr. Mullenax asked if this expenditure is one that has been approved before. Dr. Barrios explained this is required by the State and because this is grant money received (this is the third year) it must be Board Approved by the State, before it receives final grant approval. Mr. Mullenax also asked how the success of this product is gauged. Dr. Barrios explained the State provides the framework of areas the District must address such as, student performance, industry certification, infrastructure, devices, etc. and the expenditures must then be validated to verify the those prerequisites have been fulfilled. One such requirement is ensuring an entire grade level has the equipment to participate in computerized testing.

Mr. Wilson commented on the details for connectivity that is discussed in the agenda item. Dr. Barrios explained conversations are taking place with the City of Lakeland regarding this infrastructure that was originally run for video and belongs to the School District. The intent is to identify the viability of making this a data network as a long term solution, assist with the disaster recovery plan and also assist with redundancy.

Mr. Berryman commented the budget analysis indicates this money is from the Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) Mr. Perrone explained it is a new categorical but works like a grant because of the required confines provided by the State. No local funds are involved.

Item R-44 Consultative Service Agreement - TOP Schools - Educational Directions

Mr. Wilson requested this item be removed from today's agenda and no vote be taken because he does not feel that a short work session discussion will alleviate all of his concerns. He requested a special work session be scheduled specifically to discuss this item and his concerns surrounding it. Mrs. Fields stated she understood his concerns but felt it was urgent that the Board begin implementing the plan. Mr. Wilson commented he believes this provider's technique is nothing more than basic leadership philosophy and does not believe it is worthy of a \$1 million expenditure.

Mr. Berryman asked what this program can do for the District that it cannot do on its own and does this fulfill the requirements the State is mandating. Superintendent Byrd explained this is a part of the hybrid model and this is an external provider as outlined in the Turnaround Option Plan. This organization is an Academic Management Operator and will work with the teachers and principals to help move them forward.

Mrs. Cunningham commented she would like to request the Board postpone the decision to remove this item until after the group makes their presentation during the Work Session.

Mrs. Fields commented the State Board of Education said Polk has not invested as much money in the schools as they should or as much as other counties invested.

Mrs. Sellers commented it was her assumption that the State Board of Education approved

the hybrid model plan and this was a part of the plan as presented. She stated it would be difficult to change the already approved parts of the model when the District still has a great deal of work to present teachers and principals to the State Board's satisfaction. She stated she does not think changing approved parts of the plan would be well received by the State Board. Mrs. Fields reiterated the three schools that were approved by the State Board were based on this hybrid model using this management company.

Mr. Wilson said no budget has been provided for this company. He does not know where the money is coming from, where it is being spent, or how the District will move forward. He has no information available to answer any questions from constituents. He said he understands the urgency; however, he does not feel the Board is being proactive enough in this issue and he thinks this should be discussed further.

Mrs. Fields commented some of these concerns were discussed at one of the recent meetings. Additional financial specifics can be provided by Mr. Perrone. Mrs. Fields feels it is not conducive to retract any part of the approved plans, especially when two schools were denied and must be taken before the State Board again.

Mr. Berryman asked for an overview of where the School District is in regard to TOP schools at the State level. Superintendent Byrd commented Tony Bellamy, Regional Assistant Superintendent of Differentiated Accountability Schools, will make a presentation on this subject later in today's agenda.

Mr. Mullenax commented the Board must keep moving forward. He feels the Board Members have not been active participants in the creation and progression of Turnaround Option Plans.

Mr. Wilson feels the schools can be turned around and the Board must be more proactive.

Mrs. Sellers explained she thought it was made clear at the last meeting, prior to the trip to St. Augustine, that this hybrid model was going to be presented to the State Board of Education.

Item R-46 Fiscal 2016-2017 Final Budget and Millage Rates

Mrs. Fields asked Mr. Perrone if there is money in the budget to fulfill the Turnaround Option Plan (TOP) and to cover the additional efforts being made to turn the schools around.

Mr. Wilson asked for clarification as to the total expenditure that is proposed for the Plan. Mr. Perrone explained it is approximately \$5 million. Mr. Perrone stated a portion will be spent from the general fund, as well as categorical funds such as Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI), Title I, and the BP funds.

Mr. Berryman stated he would like to see the fund balance broken out into assigned and unassigned portions because it appears to have changed drastically from a year ago.

DISCUSSION ITEMS

Item 3

3. [1:30 - 2:00 PM Consultative Service Agreement-TOP Schools - Educational Directions](#)

Attachment: [Budget-Impact-Analysis-2016-17 EMO Ed Directives 8 29 16.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Exhibit B Polk ED AMO.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Appendices for Polk ED AMO.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Polk ED AMO Revised Contract 083016 ii.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Exhibit A Polk ED AMO.pdf](#)

Minutes:

Tony Bellamy, Regional Assistant Superintendent of Turnaround Schools, was joined by Robert Knight and Joe DeSensi of Educational Directions (ED), an Academic Management Organization. Mr. Bellamy explained the processes that have gone into the creation of the plans of corrective action for the turnaround schools. He also discussed the multiple meetings and revisions with District committee members and the State Board of Education in an effort to have plans for all five schools approved. The organization has been successful in multiple states, including Indiana, Ohio, Tennessee, Kentucky, and Florida.

Mr. Berryman asked which Polk schools this company worked with two years ago and what are the measurables. The two schools were Carlton Palmore Elementary and Polk City Elementary. The deliverables are attached to the contract.

Mr. Wilson stated the challenges being experienced currently are not products of this administration. He commented the one thing the State Board of Education was most interested in Polk accomplishing did not occur, which is why they had to return. He also said the State Board was looking for principals and teachers with a demonstrated record of success. It is his opinion that this organization will be successful but will not address this. He asked what role ED will play in making Polk successful and to ensure principals and teachers are in place. Superintendent Byrd explained the AMO will not select these individuals. They will only be working in collaboration with staff to build the capacity of current teachers and administrators based on the turnaround model. This group will analyze data, look at professional development, what are the root causes, and how can the building be moved toward increased student achievement.

Mr. Bellamy explained the sequence of events that led up to the denial of two of the District's turnaround plans including the State Board's fluctuation in required evaluation data up to one day prior to the presentation. Specifically the criteria that was requested after the first State Board presentation was for Value Added Measure (VAM) three year aggregate data from 2014-2015. When the District returned for the second presentation prepared with that information and having removed unsatisfactory teachers as directed, the State Board began referencing single year VAM for 2015-2016 which was not

available in July when the first meeting was held. The liaison for the State Board of Education has been in constant communication with Polk's Turnaround team. Mr. Wilson asked if there is legal ground to address the change in criteria that was requested.

Mr. Wilson discussed differentiated pay and asked what is different now than before. Superintendent Byrd explained a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) has been negotiated with the Polk Education Association (PEA). Mr. Wilson asked if the differentiated pay that is being offered is adequate. The Superintendent commented the differentiated pay for those who received Highly Effective evaluations will receive \$7,500 and those who received Effective will receive \$5,300. Mr. Wilson stated this amount is not enough and the District should resume negotiations unless they are granted the authority to arbitrarily transfer people.

Mr. Wilson asked if the District has a legal position on these actions. Wes Bridges, Counsel for the Board, commented there are possibilities; however, proving an individual has been treated different legally takes on alternate characteristics when it is political such as the State Board of Education. In order to take action you must have evidence and a forum.

Mrs. Sellers commented on the State Board change of criteria including the discussion to remove a very strong principal that was placed prior to the meeting in July. She also commented on the change of VAM data that could have prevented the removal of teachers if the State Board had given the District the single year criteria in the beginning. With all of the constant contact among the two organizations, she does not know how this lack of communication could occur.

Mr. Wilson explained he is not placing a value judgment on the teachers or administrators. He suggested hiring a consultant or a lobbyist to contact the State and find out exactly what they want and then meet those expectations.

Mr. Harris explained he was at the second State Board meeting and spoke with the Department of Education consultant. She expressed to him her surprise at the State Board reaction, the contradiction in previously mandated criteria, and the way the School District was treated in regard to other districts. He believes there were some biases among the State Board Members going into the meeting.

Mr. Berryman suggested the Superintendent and key staff should take these concerns directly to the Commissioner of Education. Superintendent Byrd commented she has already initiated a meeting with the Commissioner of Education and Chancellor of Education.

Mr. Mullenax commented on the change in direction of the State Board mid-stream and also stated any meeting with these individuals should be on-the-record instead of private.

Mrs. Cunningham stated the District needs to move forward with this contract to start getting the schools, teachers, and administrators the assistance they need. The AMO needs to be actively providing the necessary lift to turnaround the schools.

Mrs. Fields commented the second meeting with the State Board blindsided the group and they will ensure they are prepared for the next meeting. It is critical to keep the public informed about the TOP plan, where the District is in the process, and the actions being taken by ED. She commented on the importance of saving these five schools. She commended Superintendent Byrd and Mr. Bellamy for their professionalism.

Item 4

4. [2:00 - 2:15 PM BREAK](#)

Item 5

5. [2:15 - 3:15 PM Review of Potential Districtwide Redistricting Process with DeJong-Richter](#)

Attachment: [160906 DeJong Richter Board Presentation Districtwide Rezoning.pdf](#)

Minutes:

Scott Leopold, representative from DeJong Richter, discussed the potential redistricting.

Mr. Berryman asked the difference between the concurrency capacity (122,000) and functional capacity (109,000).

Mr. Harris discussed the indication on the maps that shows the Lake Alfred zoned schools that have a large number of seats available and how that affected his vote against charter schools being generated in that area of the county.

Mr. Leopold asked the Board if they prefer four regional redistricting committees or one large committee. He also asked if the Board would like to look at some tactical areas first, or take all boundaries off and start over.

Mrs. Sellers suggested placing trackers on high school students in academies, etc. and also about the affect the legislative school choice has had on school enrollment in regard to zoned areas.

Mr. Berryman asked Mr. Leopold what he has witnessed that worked in large geographical areas. Mr. Leopold explained a single large committee would be more effective.

Mrs. Fields said she thinks the District should go with a holistic approach and

have four regional committees.

Mrs. Cunningham agreed with the regional committees. She also commented she is not sure the timing is appropriate to address this subject with the current issues being experienced with Turnaround plans. Mr. Leopold stated the target date could be 2018-2019. The work could begin and identification of growth areas and populations investigated. Rob Davis, Interim Associate Superintendent of Operations, and Pam Luce, Facilities Senior Coordinator, supported moving forward with the work. Mrs. Sellers also agreed on moving forward. Mr. Mullenax commented on moving variables that the District has no control over. Mr. Wilson commented this may be one of the first times in the County that we are not able to issue builders Concurrency Certificates. He also agrees on moving forward.

Item 6

6. [3:15 - 3:30 PM Policy Updates](#)

Attachment: [Policy Updates 9616_2.pdf](#)

Minutes: Wendy Dodge, Government Liaison, discussed current policy updates. The two year requirement to review policies no longer exists. The majority of polled counties still have the 2 year review language in their policies because the language has not yet been updated. Some counties adhere to the NEOLA recommendation and one outlier has specific language that requires the review of information on a specific timeline. Mrs. Sellers asked if North East Ohio Language Associates (NEOLA) has a recommendation for the review of policies. Ms. Dodge commented "as necessary" is the NEOLA recommendation. Mrs. Sellers suggested asking NEOLA representatives if they would consider recommending a timeline for policy updates.

Item 7

7. [3:30 - 3:45 PM 2016-2017 Uniform Statewide Assessment Calendar](#)

Attachment: [Polk_K12UniformAssessmentCalendar16-17_83016.pdf](#)

Minutes:

Heather Wright, Senior Director of Assessment, Accountability and Evaluation, presented the assessment calendar template that is mandated by the State.

Mrs. Sellers would like a list of District required assessments that are not required by the State. Ann Everett, Sr. Director of K-12 Reading and Writing, commented the only assessments that meet this criteria are in writing for grades 3-10 in English Language Arts (ELA).

Mrs. Cunningham would like to see this calendar modified to reflect only the assessment that the Polk County School District requires without state or federal mandates.

Mr. Berryman commented there is a significant reduction in testing from last year to this year. Mrs. Wright confirmed the time and number of tests have been decreased.

Mr. Wilson asked if the State would allow progress monitoring to be accomplished without testing. Mrs. Wright stated it is a type of assessment and if the individual teachers created a tool the Assessment and Curriculum teams would not be able to adequately gather data. Mrs. Everett explained the Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network (PMRN) assessment is usually administered.

Mr. Harris inquired about the timing of mid-year and semester exam finals. He would like to know why the timeframe has been changed from the traditional three days at the end of the semester. He stated it was a classroom management tool. The Staff clarified the District Testing Committee requested greater flexibility in order to facilitate computerized testing. Mr. Mullenax commented, from the perspective of a parent and a former educator, the change is reflected as wasted time.

Superintendent Byrd stated the committee will be reconvening on the matter of final exams and the current projected dates are subject to change.

Mr. Wilson would like the presentation modified to show tests required by the State, the tests that the District requires, and the tests that are progress monitoring in nature identified separately.

INFORMATION ITEMS

Meeting adjourned at 3:38 PM. Minutes were approved and attested this 25th day of October, 2016.

Kay Fields, Board Chair

Jacqueline M. Byrd, Superintendent