

**OFFICE OF THE SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS**  
**JAMES F. NOTTER**  
**SUPERINTENDENT**

Telephone (754) 321-2600

Facsimile: (754) 321-2701

**School Board Workshop**  
**June 24, 2008**

**Magnet Programs, Policy 5004**

The purpose of Magnet programs is to support the School District's goal to increase and/or stabilize enrollment at selected schools, promoting diversity within schools, and ensure alignment with Diversity Policy 1.5. Magnet programs are school district models that promote educational excellence and offer students, with different interests, talents and aptitudes, unique choices that may enhance their educational success.

Staff gave an overview of the history of Magnet programs in Broward County. Magnet Programs current support to schools and district is to maintain curricular and financial support of unique characteristics at each Magnet school, annually review the status of magnet programs and implement a district wide marketing plan to attract students to magnet schools.

A future discussion is scheduled to discuss aligning and supporting educational opportunities for students through the Career & Technical Education Five-Year Strategic Plan at the September 2, 2008 workshop. Also scheduled is a discussion regarding aligning student assignment processes with educational opportunities and space available, October 28, 2008 workshop, which will include innovative programs.

The next challenging initiative of this School District is to align all District enrollment processes. Florida Class Size mandate, Magnet Policy 5004, No Child Left Behind (NCLB), Reassignment Policy 5001, and School Boundaries Policy 5000. At this time, the enrollment processes begins in January and ends the last week in March. The proposed adjustment to the magnet process will be to begin processing applications in December and end mid-February. This will align with the following timelines for NCLB/Choice Seat process, Class Size projections, reassignment and boundary timeline.

Magnet seats availability will be determined by using the NCLB/Choice seats need, class size requirements/space and projected enrollment, number of all students leaving school, and boundary recommendations.

A matrix of changes for Policy 5004 was reviewed. There is new language to ensure access to Magnet programs for active duty military families and applicants who have a sibling that is and will be attending the same Magnet school. For further information and clarification please go to the eAgenda June 24, 2008 workshop, Magnet presentation, matrix of changes, e. Access to Magnet Schools/Programs and 5., Admissions to Schools of Options, 5.f., for the new language.

Also discussed were Options and Change schools, which will now be identified as "Out-of-Boundary" (Options) and "In Boundary" (Change).

There are some Magnet schools that did not need a program to increase their enrollment. In order not to hurt the school, these programs were allowed to remain as CHANGE Magnet

programs. They currently do not fit the regular definition of either OPTIONS or CHANGE Magnet schools, but have a unique thematic program. Sawgrass Springs Middle School is one example of such a school. Further discussion regarding these schools will take place at the October 28, 2008 workshop regarding innovative programs.

The Board had further discussion regarding reassignment to a school, which has a Magnet program. This does not automatically place a student in the Magnet program. The student would have to go to his/her guidance counselor who determines the best educational program for that student. If it is determined that it is the Magnet program, the student would have to meet the criteria and there would have to be room for that student.

Board Members discussed schools offering courses that no other school is offering. Courses should be equal and the same at all schools. This would cut down on the number of reassignments, thus, not under enroll or over enroll schools, and would give all students the same opportunity.

Board Members were happy with the clarity of this revised policy. This presentation can be found on the eAgenda June 24, 2008 workshop.

### **Purchasing Policy 3320**

This is a second reading of Purchasing Policy 3320, which was previously brought before the School Board on the April 8, 2008. Staff reviewed the Board Members requested changes.

Staff advised the School Board that there would be an annual report. This report will be completed and brought to the Board after the Purchasing (P) card transactions are completed for the fiscal year.

Workspace, which is a program for real time construction projects, will also be used for technology purchasing. Board Members had a discussion regarding the Technology Advisory Committee and their recommendation capacity. This committee is a valuable tool, a watchdog, to take a second look at the District's technology purchases. The Superintendent was asked to look at the committee's roles, responsibilities, bylaws, and will bring back for a future discussion.

The School Board reviewed new language for the following items:

- Use of federal funds for the purchase of food at Head Start parent activities.
- Procedures for vendors that have been found to be noncompliant with a School Board contract.

This policy will now be brought before the School Board for approval at the July 22, 2008 Regular School Board meeting.

### **District Educational Facilities Plan (DEFP)**

Board Members requested staff to return to the June 24<sup>th</sup> workshop with further information to help them understand changes that have or have not been made to the DEFP. Staff provided the tentative 5-year plan showing changes from last year to this year. This information would show increased or decreased amounts to the project and the rationale for the change. The Board Members went through this information for elementary, middle and high schools.

Certain projects may not go forward if a boundary change may take care of the situation. Some projects that are already under way and under contract would not change or be cancelled. Prices go up on classrooms because they cost more to build. A few of the reasons the average cost of a

classroom has increased are: Fire Marshall requirements for certain specifications, change of air conditioning, and electrical wiring for additions.

It was decided by the School Board, before adding or eliminating any projects, they would like the data from boundaries, the 20 day count in September and the Plant Survey in October. Once the data is received, staff is requested to review all land purchases to make sure they are in place for the appropriate year for construction.

Board Members requested a Castaldi analysis done on Nova High, Nova Middle, Piper High, Boyd Anderson, and Bair Middle. This is an analysis to determine if a school should be torn down and replaced rather than renovating and adding additions. Generally a school has to be over 50 years old before it can be torn down.

Board Members were given a list of all the playgrounds that are being replaced. Staff is requested to put this list in a priority order for the Board.

The District Educational Facilities Plan first public hearing is June 25, 2008 at 5:30 p.m. This presentation can be found on the eAgenda June 24, 2008 workshop.

## **Comprehensive Boundaries Discussion, Part II**

### **–Miscommunication Between Policy 5000 and the Boundary Process**

Since June 2003, the Board has been provided a comprehensive boundaries review that has included:

- District-wide enrollment, capacity maps and data.
- Feeder pattern data.
- Tentative boundary process timeline.
- Other pertinent details specific to the upcoming year.

The goal of the School Board is to begin talking about district wide capacity alignment and the assumptions that drive the boundary process.

There are many considerations in developing enrollment projections, such as:

- Changes in the rate of new housing development.
- Economic conditions.
- Immigration.
- Natural phenomena.
- Changes to the location and number of student programs.
- Choice options.
- Charter Schools.

There is a big disconnect between concurrency, local and the state enrollment projections. The state projections show Broward County enrollment is still declining. The State does not consider Class Size, Virtual School, McKay Scholarship, detention centers, or school cluster programs. Autism is a good example of a cluster and how it is growing statewide. There is no recognition for subcategories. Last year, Broward County Schools asked for a waiver to use their projections and is again considering asking for a waiver this year. The Board requested staff to place the enrollment discrepancy on the District's legislative platform. The Board also requested the Superintendent to have discussions with the Chancellor and the Superintendents Association.

The School Board asked for data showing school grade improvement because of feeder patterns. Feeder patterns do help with the articulation from one school level to another. Higher-level schools would know which students are coming and what their needs are. Moving to other schools and not following feeder patterns might cause a more transient community.

The School Board discussed the timeline of the Boundary process for this year. The timeline was changed to the following:

- Hold community meetings to inform the public about the Plant Survey, Concurrency, Class Size and how they may affect boundary decisions for 2009-2010.

- November Board Workshop will go over the data from the 20-day count, the Plant Survey and Class Size.

- December workshop will review the potential changes, maps and rationale.

- After the December workshop the Superintendent will make his boundary recommendations.

- Hold boundary conferences with the community to get their feedback on the maps demonstrating

  - the Board's and Superintendent's recommendations.

- 3<sup>rd</sup> workshop will review the community recommendations with rationale in matrix format.

Staff requested the Board's direction on the assumptions that drive the boundary process. The Chair requested the Board to consider removing Assumption 6: *Continue to consider alternative enrollment and scheduling options within existing capacity that do not adversely affect teaching or learning, c. (b) double sessions.* This is not a practice of this Board. The Attorney was asked to look into this assumption and see if it could be removed. The Board would like to have a further discussion regarding the assumptions. This discussion will be held at the August 5, 2008, Board meeting, during the lunch break.

This presentation can be found on the eAgenda June 24, 2008 workshop.

JFN:jd