



VISION  
*To be a world-class school system.*

**THE SCHOOL BOARD OF LEE COUNTY**  
**School Board Briefing Meeting – M I N U T E S** (Approved 4/24/07)  
**Tuesday – March 13, 2007 / 3:30 p.m.**

---

**Attendees:** Mrs. Jeanne S. Dozier, Board Chairman  
Mr. Robert D. Chilmonik, Board Member  
Dr. James W. Browder, Secretary & District Superintendent  
Mrs. Julie Nieminski, Board Auditor  
Dr. Jane E. Kuckel, Board Vice Chair  
Mr. Steven K. Teuber, Board Member  
Mr. Keith Martin, Board Attorney  
Mrs. Denise Mangus, Recording Secretary

---

**A. BOARD MEMBERS** (*Mr. Chilmonik called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.*)

**1. Board Committee Chair Reports** – Dick Young (Compliance Advisory Committee) noted the handout “Modification to Existing Call Center Program” (copy on file with minutes); their committee listened to staff (there’s a magnitude of personnel and distribution of facilities). Committee recommendations were: make hotline and very unanimous, control info at all points (one central point), 18 hours answered weekdays, use for internal only (short time), add construction contracts next year, etc. Compliance was split on using outside vendor. Dr. Kuckel thanked Mr. Young (he researched other hotlines) and the Committee. Dr. Kuckel noted they’ll discuss this but suggested turning their recommendations over to the Superintendent and he’ll work with staff; it could be workshopped. Jack Eikenberg (former Compliance Chairman) was acknowledged.

Dr. Constance Dennis noted (24-year teacher) being thankful for the Curriculum Committee opportunity (she’s Chair). One subcommittee works on advanced learners’ needs being met. Dr. Brunick gave a thorough Exceptional Student Education (ESE) Department overview and things going on in the District; he addressed advanced learners. Committee suggestions are: 1) identify at early age (concern of the state); 2) implement consistent procedures to find those previously identified as choice; and 3) hire additional teachers as mentors for high school gifted (one person serves all grade levels). A second subcommittee works on comprehensive career and technical education; Duane Alton and Patti Elkin have presented, and the Committee’s impressed re keeping up with the state re hardware. Dr. Tihen has shared information on software and purchasing; for example, there are seven licenses for programs of ESOL students, those reading below grade level, etc. They want teachers to continue to get training and continue communication efforts to all employees on the successful software programs. A third area being looked at is safety, making schools safer, peace education, anti-bullying, DARE; the Committee’s reviewing our programs and others used. Today is an update (not recommendations).

Donna Butts gave a report (copy on file) from the District Advisory Council (DAC). She noted, for this past quarter, meeting every month; Lee Legutko, Chief Financial Officer, gave a thorough presentation in January and left no one with questions. DAC feels the security plan is good; there was some concern about police force (WINK news report) but Mr. McNerney assured this is not immediate. Ongoing topics include: foreign language (there’ll be many questions); dropout (it’s being asked what schools with 3 vs. 105 are doing differently); call center (DAC looked at superficial level/different aspect); teacher retention (glad it’s a Board goal; recommendations immediately put together with teachers present; cost for housing is a problem; ESOL and reading endorsements would’ve already been covered but would worry in first year of teaching). Mrs. Butts responded to Mrs. Dozier that DAC’s well attended (District appointee subcommittee dissolved and folded into the three school levels). Something brought up at a subcommittee level can come to DAC. Mrs. Dozier noted appreciation for recommendations from DAC on teacher retention.

David Hall (Finance Committee Chair) expressed gratitude to District staff for meeting with them and answering the Committee’s questions. He thanked Lee Legutko, Ami Desamours, Board Member Teuber, and Sheila Stancel as well. During the past quarter, they began reviewing the budget data input (from state and/or internal) and going through these. Ms. Desamours has a very lengthy agenda budget process for the year and they work with her, with their questions answered. The financial aspects of providing adequate school safety were also discussed; a lot was learned about what the District is doing. Many didn’t know about the different departments (re safety), the projects, or programs.

Mrs. Dozier spoke on the Construction Advisory Committee (Art Steidl, Committee Chair, was not present today). They've been busy taking field trips to schools, new office center, etc. The safety issue continues to be discussed (guard houses, swipe cards, cameras). At the CAC's last meeting, the Cape Coral Zoning Commission hearing was watched; District staff did an outstanding job presenting professionally the issues on ALC West. Mrs. Dozier was embarrassed to see some of the behavior at that meeting—staff was shown a great deal of disrespect, and it was a difficult and highly contested meeting but a lot of information came out (and some misinformation). Mrs. Dozier met with the Cape mayor and talked about that meeting on ALC West issue. District staff met with the Cape Council last night and did an exemplary job presenting our side; it won't be a permanent structure (we'll revisit and be good neighbors). The Council voted 4-3 to accept the proposal (in four years, something will be done with the property). Mrs. Dozier thanked Dr. Browder for his professionalism and staff. The CAC made a recommendation to talk with the Cape Council and Dr. Browder went ahead (there wasn't time to come to the Board). Separately, an example (Marsh and Ballard) of signage was shown (sign on District property); CAC thought this was a good idea. It alerts neighborhoods that there'll be some type of District facility or school there in the future.

2. **Special Areas of Board Involvement/Reports** – Will be saved for tonight (so to get through agenda).
3. **Legislative Update** – Mrs. Dozier noted she'll waive the time and put information into a memo (since lengthy and it's desired to get through agenda so to start 5:00 Teacher of the Year reception on time).
4. **School Board Auditor Evaluation Discussion** – There were no changes to the form brought today.
5. **Board Goals and Strategies** – Dr. Browder noted dovetailing nicely (see back-up information on file with minutes) into Strategic Plan. Goals are: 1) graduation rate will increase; 2) dropout rate will decrease; 3) all students in grades 3-10 will read on grade level; 4) math and science component at all levels; 5) science; 6) every graduate from high school will speak and write English; and 6) retention of Highly Qualified teachers will increase. Goals would be put in place and set forth as far as the Board's concerned. There's concern that the graduation rate's not stretching far enough; Mrs. Dozier noted complimenting the Behavior Specialist at the Pottorf dedication this morning for the demeanor of the students. Mrs. Dozier questions if the bar is being set high enough for the graduate rate increase (between the years). Mr. Teuber noted concern about linear improvement re gains and less percentage for delta percentage. If a standard's picked that's been very well achieved in the District, take the yearly increase average and project outward; it will get harder when nearer the top and more difficult to do. Dr. Kuckel noted concern about knowing strategies to get us there and draw data (which ones work or don't); she'd like specific strategies around each of the six areas and how we're going to monitor. Dr. Kuckel knows we're trying to dovetail into the Strategic Plan but wants info pulled out for these; Mrs. Dozier piggy-backed on her statement—these goals are what should drive the budget and setting the goals so when it's time to allocate funding, departments, etc. We will realize what we have to put money out there for to increase graduation rate, to emphasize science, and go down all six goals (horse behind the cart).

Dr. Itzen noted attempts made to have departments do improvement plans and right in the middle of the process to have that finalized so when they do their budget recommendations, those two come together (for next year, they're considering collapsing forms and having one process). The Board Goals are put into the process and departments say "yes, this is the first goal and part of our process." Once the process is completed in the next month, they can tell which departments are working on it and/or strategies in place. Targets are hard to set; they're arbitrary to a certain extent. Different benchmarks are used; for example, present graduation rates are looked at in other parts of Florida. It was arbitrarily set at 95 (2011-12) if other districts were 90; we looked into dividing up evenly through the years. Mr. Teuber talked about SAT/ACT scores at a previous meeting; should it be one of the priority goals (the business community looks at it). Dr. Browder noted it's included in the Strategic Plan (though it may not be a Board Goal). Mr. Chilmonik noted to summarize and what he's getting from the conversation as to what's key from Board Members and reasonable targets—can we push harder but he's unsure how we get there. Mr. Teuber noted ACT/SAT could be added as a seventh goal.

Dr. Itzen noted one clarification re increasing participation or average scores, of which the latter is the answer. Mr. Chilmonik noted doing some research on regression of the mean. Re suggestions on targets set, the Board can say to take another look on becoming more aggressive. Dr. Browder doesn't have a problem but wants to

be realistic in not wanting to give something without the tools to accomplish such; he noted we're trying to align with the A++ Plan, and we've seen improvement annually. He doesn't mind making it stretch (if getting less than 1%; world class is wanted). We'll work hard re goals; there should be no dropouts and 100% graduation rate but we'll work towards. The realistic portion becomes part of what's desired for the Board to understand; there are people working themselves to death to accomplish this. Our district is better than the state average; we appreciate this but the pressure's still on. Mrs. Dozier inquired about the percentage of 80% for math and science at all levels (2011-12) and the 80% being acceptable. It was clarified by Dr. Itzen that there's an interpretation at every grade level; they were thinking of the outcome (FCAT scores is here). If math component is in place at every grade level, math scores would go up (these are percentages of students scoring at grade level in math). The wording is wrong (have to decide on measure for that); if percent of grade levels that have component—student achievement in math and science is being talked (we're at 68%; we'll have 2% percentage point gain in math scores). There's math and science component in every grade level (drafting, time and distance, etc. being taught). Dr. Browder further noted taking this to meal (draft goal summary; would see increase in those scores—scores in math and science going up); writing, reading, math, and science is being taught in every subject area today. The language needs to be changed. Mr. Teuber noted talking with Dr. Tihen; every class has math and science component (p.e., music, etc.); Mr. Teuber doesn't feel there's one objective to have for infusion in every class. It takes 2-3 years to have dedicated math/science component and see the benefits. Reading and writing are not in there but from Dr. Browder's perspective, it's a given.

Dr. Itzen knows pressed for time. There was Goal 5 clarification; Dr. Itzen noted identifying as receiving services and not proficient in English or received services and tested out of that program (measure is students at the end of 12<sup>th</sup> grade year; standard diploma requires FCAT reading passed so where are they 1 year later, 2 years later, etc. is different measure). There's the determination of who we measure and when and what's the proficiency measure (reading, math, and eventually writing requirement). If simply to take all LY students (those who qualify ESOL services in student) and not proficient in English (would be 0%), services would be needed. If only measure of students tested out of ESOL program, 100% would be proficient; this is simple way of looking at it. At the end of 12<sup>th</sup> grade, how many of those students need ESOL and how many achieved the standard. Mr. Teuber noted this was for grammar; Mr. Chilmonik noted that when saying grammar and mechanics of English, it's for all students (to increase everyone's level) and the basic objective of when someone leaves high school, they speak English clearly as well as communicating in writing the same (feels FCAT is the best way to go). Mr. Chilmonik noted speaking English is a tool we must give to all students; he's looking for ideas from the Board. It was noted a high school junior might not leave speaking English but a middle or elementary student would speak and write. Mr. Chilmonik noted have students with 0% speaking skills. Mrs. Dozier noted they could measure the matter by developing something in place that indicates. Mr. Chilmonik noted reallocating resources to help a junior by the end of their senior year to speak and write English. Mrs. Dozier noted the student could be speaking broken English or be very articulate; she suggested sending this back to staff and let them decide measurement. Dr. Itzen will work on measures; Dr. Browder appreciates the opportunity to take this back and work on it.

**B. ACADEMIC SERVICES** – no items for discussion today

**C. HUMAN RESOURCES** – no items for discussion today

**D. ADMINISTRATIVE/SUPPORT SERVICES**

**1. Change Orders – February 2007** (no discussion but see back-up information copy on file with minutes)

**E. BUSINESS SERVICES**

**1. Administrative Software Project – Business Software Solution Project Manager:** Dr. Browder noted a memo (to save time today) could be put together for the Board but Dolores Shelhorse is here to answer any quick questions. Mr. Chilmonik would like five minutes on this. (Please see back-up/copy on file for this agenda item.) Ms. Shelhorse noted briefing the Board last November; she showed the slide from back then (with the points). The next step was Board approval of the ranking and to begin negotiations (completed 12/5). The second step was to identify the two-phase independent project manager (some of the responsibilities were noted). The RFP (tab 2 in book) was 1/3; of 16 vendors, 3 responded—KP&G, IBM, and Cyber Partnering. Personnel, Budget, Payroll, Budget, Information Systems comprised the Evaluation Committee (tab 5 has scoring tool of which IBM and Cyber were selected; Cyber was ranked as vendor of

choice). There are terms and conditions. At the 4/3 Action Meeting, there'll be request authorization to commit with Cyber as the contractor for the next phase. Mrs. Dozier thanked Ms. Shelhorse for making it user-friendly for the Board.

2. **New School Allocations for FY08** – this item was unable to be discussed (see back-up info with minutes)

F. **EXECUTIVE SERVICES** --- no items for discussion today

H. **BOARD ATTORNEY / BOARD INTERNAL AUDITOR / SUPERINTENDENT'S COMMENTS** (this was done prior to Public Comment)

1. **Final Audit Report – Procurement:** Mrs. Nieminski noted today's back-up of the final report for the procurement audit; there are four parts—vendor set-up; purchasing; bidding; and construction contract review. She didn't find any violation of contracts (all were fine) nor any bid or purchase splitting. Most weaknesses found are about the current system used and lack of written department procedures (but the monitoring has started). Many manual processes are used but the new system will have checks and balances, with automatic flagging (not errors but exceptions). She will address at the 4/3 meeting (20 minutes for discussion/Q&A) but she can be contacted prior. Mr. Teuber asked if she was working with Ms. Shelhorse's group of which Ms. Nieminski is (meetings set up through Ms. Shelhorse and Budget); her concerns are to be captured in the new system. Mr. Chilmonik thanked her for putting things together (report) professionally; Mrs. Nieminski worked heavily with the programmers who extracted the data she put in an Excel format. In looking at the documentation and the many departments (Purchasing, Maintenance, Accounting, Budget, etc.), the scope was large but she didn't just skim over—Mrs. Nieminski went into a lot of detail to understand how it was working and look at it thoroughly as she could. Re the construction piece, she looked at liability and bonding requirements; Mrs. Nieminski looked at the Cuthill and Eddy findings. She wants to see more action taken by management; recommendations (internal and external) have been received and wants to make sure District responds in written format as she would expect hers to be responded to (though review first is needed).

G. **PUBLIC COMMENT** – Bob Rushlow, SPALC President, noted looking at the proposed new school budget allocations for 2008; he has several questions and concerns--#4, schools must make realizations re funding (class size, reduction of support staff). Mr. Rushlow understands the Superintendent trying to stay within budget but what point will it stop; class sizes cannot be funded on the back of support staff (even security guards are being rid of). What about the fund balance carryover from a previous year? Perhaps it could be used for support staff, raises, teachers. He sees support staff reduction in FY08 and questions what happened to the money; he knows it's a draft but is concerned about providing for students so they can achieve. Mr. Rushlow also asked about the definition of a cluster (how many ESE in a cluster and/or is it classes in a school?). What he sees in the formula is more paraprofessionals being cut, and feels student achievement will be affected. Meeting was adjourned at 4:58 p.m.

/dwm

---

MINUTES BOOK NO. 41 - FY07

---

---

**Robert D. Chilmonik**, Meeting Chair

ATTEST:

---

**James W. Browder, Ed.D.**, Secretary and District Superintendent

*An audio/visual tape of this meeting has been produced to provide a verbatim record of the proceedings. Members of the public may obtain a copy of the tape of any meeting by making a request for such through the Communications Department and paying the actual cost of copying the tape. Members of the public may view any Board meeting tape at the Communications Department at no cost. Anyone wishing to view a Board meeting tape should contact the Communications Department at 337-8327 to make such a request.*