

10 12 2010 Work Session

New Business

1. [8:30 - 8:40 AM School Board Comments](#)

Board Agenda Review

2. [8:40 - 9:00 AM Review Agenda of October 12, 2010](#)

Attachment: [10 12 10 School Board Meeting Revised.pdf](#)

Minutes:

C-19 Symetra Stop Loss Renewal

- Mrs. Fields was unable to view the chart attached electronically and requested a hard copy.
- Mrs. Cunningham questioned how the figures were calculated. Mr. Grey will provide that to her.
- Mr. Mullenax asked for the fixed cost to the district. Mr. Grey reported approximately \$669,000. It was not placed out for bid because our high number of claims would not benefit us in a lower premium.

C- 23 Farmworkers Grant

- Mrs. Sellers questioned the half-time position; will it be throughout the grant? Mr. Small reported that it is only for this year.

R-48 Polk Pre-Collegiate High School Charter Application

- Mr. Harris stated that he has heard that this does not have the support of the Pre-Collegiate High School. Great concept but it is not a good location.
- Mrs. Bridges informed the Board that the only option is to approve the application as it is submitted, the applicant cannot change what was submitted originally. They will

use the 'nesting' concept with Berkley Accelerated Middle staff in order to be profitable the first year (Share staff). The application included a letter of support from Bridget Fetter, of Pre-Collegiate High School.

- Mr. Harris reported that that letter was in their application last year; it is not a current letter of support and he doesn't believe Mrs. Fetter knew it was submitted with this year's application.
- Dr. McKinzie commented that she doesn't believe a denial would be supported in an Appeal. The application states that they will recruit throughout the district, but the criteria states students have to have completed Algebra 1.
- Mrs. Lofton stated the number of enrollment for the first year is 25. She asked if BOK Academy was also feared to have an impact on McLaughlin Middle.
- Mrs. Bridges reported that an arts program was implemented at McLaughlin to attract and retain their students. The district took a proactive direction. Spook Hill was impacted by the surrounding elementary charter schools in regards to class size much more this year than prior years.

3. [9:00 - 9:15 AM BREAK](#)

Discussion

Item 4

4. [9:15 - 10:15 AM RTTT Update](#)

Attachment: [Polk County Schools RTTT Final Scope of Work Template 10 12 2010.pdf](#)

Attachment: [RTTT School Board Summary.pdf](#)

Minutes:

David Lewis, Associate Superintendent of Learning, reported that 45 individuals and 13 team leaders worked on meeting the rigorous requirements of RTTT before DOE's November 9th deadline.

The centerpieces of the reform are

- district-devised systems for teacher and principal performance appraisals
- related pay-for-performance systems
 - systems must apply to all classroom teachers of all subjects and school principals by the end of year 4 (2013-2014)
 - appraisal results also to feed compensation and other human capital decisions based on teacher and principal effectiveness

We are required to apply differentiated compensation based on student

achievement to a preponderance of classroom teachers by the end of the 2013-2014 school year. Accomplishing this will depend upon having valid and reliable assessments in place to measure student gains and upon future collectively bargained employment agreements.

- overarching project plans - comprehensive reform plan that connects and coordinates all of the assurance area
- Strategic plan
- Polk County's RTTT goals
 - build district capacity
 - valid student assessment tool (CRITICAL ISSUE); develop an infrastructure to implement student growth model of assessment in non-FCAT subjects
 - Rewards for Excellence - OJP model: a third goal to reward teachers for student learning gains: includes an extended day, intended hours for student and parent meetings and events, regular professional development including modeling lesson study for the district, and bonuses for progress in the Differentiated accountability matrix
- Increase the graduation rate
- Polk's RTTT Enhancement Budgeting - DOE recognizes that they are not providing sufficient funds to do all that is required in RTTT; districts must align other federal funds to accomplish the goals set forth in the MOU.
- Lesson study training for more than a year
- Department of Academic Rigor, supported by a federal Advanced Placement Incentive Program grant, has built on an existing upward trend in advanced course work and is building middle school systems to feed more students into college-bound course programs
- Polk has had committees working on revised evaluation systems that reflect the use of student performance information, for both teachers and principals, and is piloting the new principal performance evaluation system.

Positions required to monitor RTTT:

- RTTT Grant Director
- Secretary
- contracted professional services (evaluator, budget analyst, monitor for charter schools)
- senior programmer
- data analyst
- assessment coordinator

Biggest concern is sustainability after the grant ends in a fluctuating economy.

Mrs. Sellers asked if the state or district will establish end of year exams? Mr. Lewis commented that in a word - Yes. It is hoped that DOE has it accomplished by the deadline with the help of FADSS and other educational

partners. If not, districts will need to establish the exams.

Mrs. Lofton asked for clarification on the \$1.4 million cost of 75 end of course exams. Mr. Lewis and Wilma Ferrer (Senior Director of Assessment and Accountability) established the cost based on 40-50 questions per test; 4-6 different tests per course (pre/post tests).

Mrs. Fields inquired on funding for charter schools. Mr. Lewis commented that a maximum of \$1.5 million flows out to charters as a cash flow basis. Charters decide whether they want services or dollars. Mrs. Fields would like to see timeline for hiring.

Mrs. Sellers asked if charters join in the grant, do they have to follow our plan?

Mrs. Bridges commented there are 54 deliverables; if charters join our plan, they have to follow 30 of those deliverables; the other set of deliverables do not apply to charters. Services vs. dollars: charters have the option to take the percentage dollars and establish their own system. They can't opt into only one deliverable, it's all or none of them.

Mrs. Lofton asked what happens if the charter school takes the dollars and does not comply with the RTTT requirements? Will it affect their charter contract with us?

Mrs. Bridges replied that charter performances do impact districts. They can join for a year and if they decide it's not working they can withdraw. She doesn't believe there should be a penalty if they tried and fail to meet the goals. We have to review their plans to meet the goals and monitor their progress.

Mrs. Lofton asked what happens if they take the dollars and don't follow the plan? Do they return the dollars? Mrs. Bridges stated they would have to demonstrate how they spent the dollars in the appropriate areas. Mrs. Lofton asked if there is an appeals process if they fail in RTTT? Mrs. Bridges reported this was put before DOE and their response was VERY vague. It will be viewed on a case by case basis. If they take the money and purposely spend in non RTTT areas, the case will probably be upheld; if they tried to make the RTTT work and failed, they would be held harmless.

Mr. Harris commented that his biggest concern is the sustainability beyond the fourth year. There will be some cost to the district: infrastructure maintained and the online testing will continue past the four year grant term.

Mr. O'Reilly commented that out of the \$700 million received by the state, DOE will retain \$350 million and our allocation is \$23 million.

DOE's allocation:

- \$21 million to develop tests for hard to measure subject areas
- \$4.5 million for increased access to STEM courses

- \$8 million for summer academies for lowest 5% schools (71 schools listed by state)
- \$10 million to improve and expand STEM career and professional academies
- \$12 million in one to implement community compacts in one LEA
- Other services such as training to use state data, technology help for rural areas
- \$6.8 million for 9 content experts; 9 skilled finance and operations specialists on staff
- \$2.3 million for indirect cost
- balance of \$20 million for travel, communications, technology services and other options
- \$60.5 million to develop interim and formative assessments
- \$6.4 million for classroom support lesson study
- \$11.8 million to support accessing and using state data
- \$14 million to support using data to improve instruction
- \$5.8 million to improve measurement of academic gains (such as via statewide coaching standards)
- \$4.8 million to support implementing 'rigorous, transparent, and fair evaluation systems or teachers and principals'
- \$25.6 million to improve teacher and principal preparation programs
- \$10.2 million to improve access to teachers in hard-to-staff subjects and assignment of teachers to high-poverty / minority schools
- \$1.6 million to apply performance measures of teacher and principal preparation programs
- \$5.4 million to improve LEA's professional development programs
- \$0.7 million to establish a community of practitioners
- \$2 million to evaluate the Great TEachers and Leaders component
- \$6 million for a leadership pipeline for turnaround schools administrators
- \$1.5 million to build leadership capacity in rural LEAs
- \$20 million to partner with effective charter school operators
- \$12.5 million for regional reading coordinators
- \$7 million for regional STEM coordinators

Item 5

5. [10:15 - 10:45 Project Discussion, Project PASS - Business System Restructure, \\$986,400, Systems Applications](#)

Attachment: [School Board Summary - PASS - Busn Sys Restructure.pdf](#)

Attachment: [PASS - Business System Restructure 2010-09-21.pdf](#)

Minutes:

Mark Grey, Assistant Superintendent of Business Services, Abdu Taguri, Assistant Superintendent of Information Services and Technology, and Cyndi Wolf, Director of Systems Applications, reported that schools have been asking for better tracking of information on financials. This is the first phase to provide functionality for a myriad of opportunities (possibly RTTT) to track

things that we currently we are not able to do so.

Mr. Taguri stated that from the technology standpoint, it will provide a better integration of the data available. This project will move us years ahead to provide interaction systems. Financial and instructional sides will be enhanced.

Mrs. Cunningham asked what is the time frame to implement?

Mark and Abdu reported that it has to be at the beginning of a new fiscal year; July 1, 2011.

Mrs. Fields asked if the cost of the program will impact or delay any current project (capital improvement project)? Mr. Grey said there is no impact on any current Capital Improvement project. Future phases might be funded with RTTT funds. It is unknown at this time if the program can support RTTT requirements.

Mr. Harris asked if this program will allow grants to be monitored? Abdu reported the system will provide better tools to view and monitor grants; reduce the redundancy of information. SAP does not encumbrance all that we do.

Sheila Phelps, Senior Internal Auditor, noted that it addresses several audit concerns.

Item 6

6. [10:45 - 10:55 AM 2011 Legislative Platform](#)

Attachment: [2011 Platform Draft 1 for Work Session.pdf](#)

Minutes:

Dr. McKinzie reported there have been discussions to make changes to the current FRS Drop program: contribution rates, age, and other areas.

Mr. Harris asked if it includes moving the entry date at age 62? Dr. McKinzie reported that has been one of the discussion.

Item 7

7. [10:55 - 11:00 Class Size Update](#)

Attachment: [Adjustments to Meet ClassSize SY11 CxC.pdf](#)

Minutes:

Dr. Tonjes reported that the district will meet the class size requirements. This morning there were 37 students and 16 teachers out of compliance.

- 43 teachers have been moved from class to class;
- added 7 units,
- hired a number of subs to co-teach;
- 39 combo classes (most in elementary K/1 and 3/4)
- secondary schools were allowed to take a discretionary unit and spread it out throughout the day.

Total cost is approximately \$800,000 in addition to the hundreds of teachers and staff repurposed, hiring subs, etc. Very little was caused by increased enrollment but is an attempt to come to the compliance level. We will be totally in compliance by Friday - however, this is a moving target. We do extraordinary extreme moves to a moving target.

Mrs. Cunningham asked if it would be better to keep things as they are after the election? Dr. Tonjes stated that by Monday there could be classes out of compliance; do we keep those over the level or try to make it an even playing field? This Friday begins FTE week, we have to count every student and be in compliance. Co-teaching solves most problems at the elementary level.

Mr Mullenax reported that at the Central Florida School Boards Coalition meeting it became apparent that, from a Central Florida point of view, a lot of people have spent an extraordinary amount of time and energy to meet something that doesn't benefit us.

Dr. McKinzie reported that this has had a huge impact on our high schools and academies. Students want to enter the academies but can't because the core academic classes are filled.

Mr. Harris asked what happens if the amendment fails? Dr. McKinzie responded that FTE reporting is held in February and the state has not definitely stated what happens at that time; whether it is a year long requirement or an October reporting requirement.

Mr. O'Reilly asked why can't we request the Legislature to allow us, after the 15th, the opportunity to use a school-wide average like charter schools.

Mr. Mullenax reported that Rep. Stargel stated that the state has spent \$19 billion on the implementation of the amendment. He does not see how it benefits education.

Dr. McKinzie commented it would interesting to see what happens to those districts that refused to meet the requirements.

Information

Item 8

8. [Academic Tournaments Continuation Grant Application 2010-2011](#)

Attachment: [Academic Tourney Board Summary Impact 10-11.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Coordinator Academic Competitions.pdf](#)

Adjournment

October 12, 2010 Work Session adjourned at 11:45 AM. Minutes were approved and attested this 26th day of October, 2010.

Kay Fields, Board Chair

Sherrie B. Nickell, Ed. D, Superintendent