

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

**Robert W. Runcie
Superintendent Of Schools**

Telephone: 754-321-2600

Facsimile: 754-321-2701

**School Board Workshop
September 27, 2011**

Policy 6000.1, Student Progression

Staff came before the Board to discuss the many changes for Policy 6000.1, some of which were previously discussed at the September 15, 2011 workshop regarding graduation and core subjects.

Policy 6000.1 has a committee that reviews the statutory changes and policy revisions. At today's workshop the committee's recommendations and statutory changes were presented.

First, staff wanted to let the Board know that the District is entering into the SACS accreditation process. The School District has submitted the self-guided report and has heard that it was well done. The School District is doing what it needs to do to have continuous improvement.

The changes to School Board Policy 6000.1, which are mostly alignment with Florida Statute, Florida Administrative Code Rule, or clarification of wording are regarding:

- Changes to Special Diploma. Aligns with Florida Administrative Code Rule 6A-1.09961.
- Add Online Diploma Requirement. Aligns with the Digital Learning Act (HB 7197).
- Change to Accelerated Diploma Options. Aligns with new wording in Florida State Statute 1003.429 (6).
- Add End of Course Exam language. Language added to policy as part of graduation requirements.
- Changes to Exam Waivers. All Students including middle school students taking a specific high school course, and achieving an A or B grade, be entitled to waive their mid term or final exams.
- GPA-High School Course taken in Middle School. Include high school courses taken in middle school in all GPA calculations.
- Middle School Promotion Criteria. Remove reference to FCAT scores and National Educational Technology Standards (NETS).
- JROTC Physical Education Waiver. Include the Local Life Management requirements as part of the PE graduation requirement JROTC waiver.
- Pre-first Grade. Removed, no longer offer pre-first grade.
- Guidance, Change Division. Guidance is now part of Core Curriculum.
- Assessment Exemptions-ELL students. ELL students are no longer eligible for FCAT exemption.
- College Readiness. Aligns language to F.S. 1008.30. All students must be tested before grade twelve for post-secondary education.

- Graduation Requirements for Transfer Students. Requirements are based on the date the student entered ninth grade, which aligns with State graduation requirements, F.S. 1003.428 based on cohort.
- Graduation Exercises. Reworded to show violation of Code of Conduct will exclude any student from participation in ceremony.
- Eligibility for Dual Enrollment. Language added to show that the unweighted GPA used to determine eligibility is inclusive of any college course the student has taken.
- Co-enrollment. Alignment with new legislation in revised F.S. Section 1011.80 (10) changing co-enrollment courses from two to one.

Further explanation regarding the above items can be found in the material for this presentation on the eAgenda, September 28, 2011 workshop.

Board Members had a discussion regarding exam waivers and thought that there should be no waivers and students should not be able to waive out of any mid term and final exams. A student should take the mid year exams no matter what their grades are or what programs they are in, such as: IB or AP. Board Members also thought that if a student is required to take the End of Course (EOC) exam from the State there should not also be a class final exam. Board Members requested that the mid term exam be a reflection of the EOC exam. Mid term exams give teachers a good understanding of how well a student is doing, shows the success of their classroom, and helps prepare students for the EOC State exam. It is very important that the School District is consistent throughout all schools regarding the exams students take and that each student is graded on the same standards. Staff stated that they would bring this suggestion back to the committee and will return at the October 25th workshop with their recommendation. Board Member asked that teachers and principals be sensitive to how many exams a student is taking in one day and to spread them out as much as possible.

Staff was asked about interim reports and if a hard copy was going home, as well as electronically sent. The policy states that parents will be sent an interim report if a student has a D or F. Board Member felt that what is stated in policy is not being followed. Staff is requested to get with the Area Superintendents to make sure this is occurring.

Regarding the change in co-enrollment, which changes taking two credits to one, Board Member requested that this be communicated to parents through parent groups so they are aware of this change.

Board Member stated a concern regarding the requirement of all students taking the college readiness assessment and feels there is a difference between being work force and college ready and hopes that discussion will occur with the Department of Education.

Staff was requested to review the 0-4 grading system that is in place. Zero being an F, 4 a D or 65, 3 a C or 75, 2 a B or 85 and 1 an A or 95. If a student receives an 87 there is no way to reflect this, it would still be a 2. A student has no way to increase his grade because it has to fall in the 0-4. If a student receives a 98 it is still a 4. The grading system in place does not benefit the student. Students know this so they do not try to perform better to increase a grade because they know it will still be the same. Also, Board Member stated that a student should not be graded on their behavior in a classroom. Board Member would like staff and the committee to look into changing the grading system to a numerical system.

Staff will come back to the October 25th workshop to further discuss Policy 6000.1. Material for this presentation can be found on the eAgenda September 27, 2011 workshop.

Diversity Committee

Staff gave a brief overview of Policy 1.5. Policy 1.5 was originally called the Biracial Committee, which was adopted to comply with the desegregation order in 1987. June 1996 the Diversity Committee was established and October 1996 the Desegregation Task Force was dissolved. There were further changes to the Diversity Committee, such as: added student representation; increased Board appointees, due to going from seven to nine School Board Members; amended in 2004 to clarify committee composition, term of office and functions; revised definition of educational equity; and recently changed the presentation dates of the Superintendents Annual CCC Settlement Status Report and the Diversity Committee Annual Response Report.

Policy 1.5, Diversity Committee, is a direct link to the CCC Settlement Agreement. On August 1, 2000, the Board approved the agreement by and between Citizens Concerned About Our Children. Compliance indicators were developed by the Diversity Committee in order to determine compliance with the CCC Settlement Agreement. The Diversity Committee functions, per Policy 1.5, were reviewed. Also discussed were the Diversity, Cultural Outreach & Prevention Department School and District support functions.

The discussion at today's workshop was predominately about the structure of the Diversity Committee and whether or not the structure of the committee should be changed and split into two or more committees. One committee should deal with the CCC Agreement and SBBC policies. The focus on the CCC Agreement is so important and the committee should not be distracted with other issues. Meetings are only two hours long and it is important that the agenda does not get overwhelmed with too many topics. Human rights issues and bullying needs another avenue and needs to be its own entity.

Board Members wanted to hear from the community before moving on with the discussion regarding the structure of the Diversity Committee and should it be changed. The scope of the Diversity Committee and the focus is guided by Policy 1.5 and includes the definition of equity. It was brought out how important it is that Board Members have a discussion with their appointees regarding the objectives of the Committee and to deal with issues that are important today. If the issues of equity are not being addressed properly, then yes the Committee should be split to address human rights issues.

What is most important is to address issues that concern all students, so they have the best opportunity for success. No matter how many committees are needed to address the issues of today, it should be done. Bullying in our schools and cyberbullying must be addressed. The lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender (LGBT) students are one of the groups of students that are targeted. Any type of bullying cannot be tolerated and it was the feeling of the Board and community that there must be a committee to address issues in today's world.

The Diversity Committee cannot devote enough time to this effort. These discussions take time and the School District is just learning how we can shift the mindset to deal with these issues. All students must be supported and needs a committee that would hear student issues and help create a safe nurturing environment for every student. Too many youths are suffering in silence.

It was brought out that there would have to be a connection with the new Human Rights Committee and the Diversity Committee. It was suggested that a member from the

Diversity Committee would sit on the Human Rights Committee and vice versa, sharing ideas in order to not duplicate efforts. There are several community groups that support LGBT people and could be partners with the new Human Rights Committee. It was suggested to reinstate the Anti-bullying Task Force. The Anti-bullying Task Force developed for the School District's Bullying policy, which has been used as a model for the State and the country.

The community also suggested the following:

- Inclusion should be a part of the diversity definition, leaving no one behind.
- A member from the Diversity committee should be on the Policy 6000.1 Student Progression Committee.
- Reduce the number of Board appointments from three to two. The Committee is too big to do what is needed.
- It was pointed out that there is are no positive points in the curriculum regarding LGBT students and the contributions they have made.
- Anti-Bullying Task force should be reinstated to continue its work on the bullying policy and cyberbullying.

Staff stated that the Office of Prevention is grant funded and will end after this year. One of the functions of this Department gives training at schools on issues such as bullying. Staff is aggressively looking at grants to support this Department. Board Members want this Department to continue and the Superintendent is requested to find funding. Board Member suggested reaching out to public partnerships and work together.

The Interim Superintendent was asked if there would be a financial impact if the Diversity Committee was split and was requested to look at what would be required regarding staff support and other resources. The Interim Superintendent will come back to the Board with that information.

The Interim Superintendent recommended that the School District address suicides. This is a national problem and should be addressed at a higher level.

Staff stated that they would take back the recommendation brought forth today and explore how many new committees would be needed to address concerns discussed. This would not be an overnight discovery and would take time. Policy 1.5 would need to be revised and a new committee formed per Policy 1.7. Staff stated they would be back at the end of the school year and wanted the Board to know that this would not be finalized in time to meet the November Organizational meeting timeline.

With changes coming to the Diversity Committee the Board stated it would be important when they appoint people to the Committee to inform them there will be changes coming regarding the Diversity Committee's structure. Staff is requested to inform members during the orientation process of the changes to come.

The Chair thanked everyone for the fantastic job and rich discussion that they had. Material for this presentation can be found on the eAgenda September 27, 2011 workshop.

District-Operated Charter Schools

There are 76 charter schools this year currently serving 29,200 students. Two municipalities govern their charter schools: City of Coral Springs and City of Pembroke Pines. Fifty-three new applications have been submitted as of August 1, 2011.

Charter schools are here to stay and are promoted by the State and Federal Government. Charter schools give parents choice and is the driving reason that charters are growing. Charter schools offer K-8 and high school 9-12. Parents like the idea of not changing schools between elementary and middle.

Board Member's had a discussion regarding the possibility of the School District creating district charter schools under a board comprised of School Board Members, use vacant seats in existing schools to create charter schools within a school, or create District Management Operations to provide services to Charter Schools.

A number of factors must be considered regarding these issues. Not only does the Florida Statute need to be considered regarding applying for or operating a charter school, but also the constitutional and statutory duties possessed by School Board Members to operate, control, and supervise all free public schools located within the School District, and statutory and district application timelines must be met. In addition, statutory law makes a distinction between creating a new charter school and converting an existing public school to charter school status. If an existing District School is converted to a charter, specifications must be taken to measure teacher and parent support prior to the charter school conversion. The conversion starts with the school and it is the school that decides to use the School District as a management entity or someone else.

If an existing school were changed to a charter school, the District could assist the charter school with curriculum rather than the school hiring someone from outside. Miami Dade has a model and would be a good model as an example. The District has the infrastructure and could provide that expertise immediately. It would not require the District to invest, in that we already have the infrastructure. As a management company, the School District does supply food services and transportation to a few charter schools. The School District would have to look at existing staff to see how we would be able to expand that idea. The School District does charge for its services.

Another idea would be to apply for or operate a new charter school. There are statutory issues when serving both as a sponsor and charter school operator. General Counsel pointed out that the charter school governance issue requires an analysis of the State Code of Ethics for public officers and employees.

The Board requested General Counsel to continue its research looking into managing of a charter school regarding the ethical conflict of a district employee serving on the Board of Directors and the other models as well.

Board Member stated FSU is the sponsor of a charter school and is that a possibility that we use a sponsor as well, which may allow us more flexibility. General Counsel is requested to look into the idea of having a university to act as a sponsor to oversee the charter school.

Board Member stated we are the primary educator in this county and the School District should be able to run a charter school like a magnet school.

Board Member asked why would the School District not expand magnet schools rather than going into charter schools. Magnet Program expansion is through grant funding. Due to the decrease of State funding, the School District has not been able to expand. Staff is looking at expanding innovative schools and innovative zones. Staff will be coming before the Board at the November 8, 2011 workshop to have further discussion.

Staff pointed out that it is not the innovative programs that attract charter school parents. It is that charter schools focus on K-8 with a feeder pattern to 9-12. Parents do not want their children to change schools. Charter schools also cap enrollment and there are no boundary changes. Board Member suggested a charter school in the work place and requested staff to see if there is a model for a partnership. The School District opens their doors to every child and we do not have a cap on enrollment.

Board Member wanted to know how Polk County School District took over the charter schools and how many schools do they have. What model did they use and how is that working?

The Board agreed that the ethical problem must first be considered. The other is a business decision, and if that would be profitable. The School District would like to be on a level playing field with charter schools.

The reason for this discussion came up due to the School District's under enrolled schools. If the School District can identify aspects of charter schools that are attractive, such as the K-8 model, it can be duplicated. The goal is to keep students in public schools. The Board stated that we must listen to the families and have open dialogue with the communities. They are telling us things by leaving our schools. The Parent Involvement Committee is looking at this. What are the things that our competitors are doing? The School District must establish the continuum of education through zones.

The next step is creating a dynamic marketing plan showing what we are doing. Board Member suggested taking an under enrolled middle school and making it into a K-8. There is room for a variety of things to do to help enrollment and parent involvement, which all ties together. Staff is requested to see what other districts are doing and how that is working. We can be competitive by offering better services for a lower price. Staff stated that they would come back with a proposal to move forward regarding a conversion to management, using a sponsor, and look at the legal ramifications.

Material for this presentation can be found on the eAgenda September 27, 2011 workshop.

Redistricting Timeline

Staff came before the Board with the final timeline for the redistricting process, which will end in 2013. Due to the Superintendent search, bringing the new Superintendent to the District, SACS Accreditation, and boundary process, it was decided not to do redistricting this year as the County and State are doing, but to allow more time to be transparent and not rush this very big process. It was important to the Board that the community had enough time to give input. Board Member requested in order for to have a complete record, to keep the shortened timeline that was brought forward to the Board for their consideration, but discovered that it would not be ample time for the community to have input and be completely transparent.

Some issues that are being considered is to redistrict according to the schools in a Board Member's district and align the districts with equal constituents.

There are redistricting guidelines that must be adhered to, such as: the Florida Statute 1001.36, equal population in districts, and redistricting will be in odd numbered years. There are also traditional guiding principles: a districts geographic shape; minimizing the

crossing of city, county, town lines, and other local boundaries; and preserving communities of interest.

Staff also asked the Board if the redistricting process would be exempt from Policy 1.7, due to timeframe for the process. The Board agreed. On October 18, 2011 Regular School Board meeting, a School Board resolution will come forward to approve the composition of the guiding principles, Redistricting Steering Committee, committee member exemption from Policy 1.7 for committee timeframe only, and that no redistricting steering committee member be running for office. Board Member requested that those on the steering committee be advised of the duties of this committee and time needed to complete the workload.

Board Members request that staff move forward in an expeditious manner and be completely transparent. Material for this presentation can be found on the eAgenda September 27, 2011 workshop.

Policy 1100B, Lobbyist Activities for Economic Gain

Staff came before the School Board with recommendations to align Policy 1100B, Lobbyist Policy and Policy 1007, Ethics Code for School Board Members.

In December 2009, the District revised Policy 1100B, Lobbyist, and includes:

- The definition of a lobbyist, which was expanded to include individuals engaging in lobbyist activities regardless of whether they are compensated or not.
- Agents of a company lobbying on behalf of their company.
- A definition of lobbying activities, which identifies lobbying as intent to influence any action of the School Board or District staff for economic gain.
- The Cone of Silence language relative to procurement solicitation.
- A penalty provision for violating the policy.

In May 2011, the School Board approved Policy 1007, Ethics Code for School Board Members, which states School Board Members shall report any and all lobbying activity that knowingly occurs between School Board Member and individual lobbyists. Policy 1007 also refers to campaign contribution fundraising.

Staff is recommending revision to Policy 1100B to align with Policy 1007 regarding lobbyist and the Cone of Silence, which references any proposer or lobbyist for a proposer is prohibited from having any communication concerning this solicitation for a competitive procurement with any School Board Member, the Superintendent of Schools, or any evaluation committee member after the Supply Management & Logistic Department releases the solicitation to the public.

Also in question was whether unions and meet and confer representatives needed to register as lobbyist in consideration of Policy 1100B and Policy 1007. General Counsel responded for purposes of these policies, a person representing employee bargaining groups is not considered a lobbyist, when acting on behalf of the employee bargaining group.

Board Members referred to Policy 1100B, page two, number 8. Senior level employees and School Board Members are prohibited from lobbying activities for one year after

employment or term of office has been severed. Board Members wanted this increased to two years. Staff is requested to see what the legislature rule and other entities say.

Board Member referenced a student working on a School Board Member's campaign. This is not allowed. A student can work for another campaign and receive service hours. Staff is requested to reference this in the Ethics policy.

The Board was happy that the Policy 1100B, which places responsibility on the lobbyist not the Board Member, is crystal clear, and transparent. Material for this presentation can be found on the eAgenda September 27, 2011 workshop.

DC:jd