Meeting Minutes
Duval County Public Schools

January 19, 2021, Board Workshop

Ms. Elizabeth Andersen, Chairman
Mr. Darryl Willie, Vice-Chairman
Dr. Kelly Coker
Ms. Lori Hershey
Mr. Warren Jones
Ms. Charlotte D. Joyce
Ms. Cindy Pearson
Dr. Diana Greene, Superintendent

ATTENDANCE AT THIS MEETING OF THE DUVAL COUNTY SCHOOL BOARD: All Board Members were present. Dr. Diana Greene, Superintendent, and Ms. Karen Chastain, Office of General Counsel, were also present.

Call Meeting to Order
The meeting was called to order at 10:38 a.m.

Note: The order of topics discussed was changed to

- *Strategic Plan*
- *Master Facility Plan Project Cycles*
- *SREF Requirements*
- *Governance*

Items to be Discussed

1. SREF REQUIREMENTS

Through a PowerPoint presentation, (see attached in agenda), Assistant Superintendent of Operations Paul Soares reviewed the differences between the State Requirement for Educational Facilities (SREF) vs. non-SREF building requirements and cost comparisons. He noted that Duval falls short of having enough hurricane shelter space based on our population.

Board Member questions:

- If charter schools are public buildings, why are they not held to the same building standards as traditional public schools?
    - The legislature enacted statutes that provide for that.
- Is it that same legislature that requires hurricane shelters be in schools?
    - Yes
- Does the legislature allow the District to build using non-SREF requirements?
    - Yes. Ms. Chastain reviewed those exception situations, referring to slide 4 in the presentation.
- Will the MFP affect the number of new shelters we need to build?
    - There are only one or two schools being demolished or consolidated that are shelters; most of the schools were built before the building standards came out.
- Will the census have an impact on the requirements?
    - Possibly--will check and get back with the Board. The need certainly will not decrease.
- When a room is designated for Exceptional Student Education (ESE) students, it is often larger but with fewer students. The Florida Inventory of School Houses (FISH) report would show that more students could be put into that room. Would we be better off having non-SREF schools so we could better match the FISH report?
    - The FISH report considers the square footage of the entire school size, not on a room-by-room basis. When rooms are used for students occasionally, FISH views that as room for more students and it actually hurts the District in meeting requirements if the room is not designated as ESE from the beginning.
- If a school does not have something built to SREF building code, is it classified as non-SREF or does it have to have multiple instances of non-conformity?
    - It depends on if it is a recommendation or requirement. If the Board wants to waive an SREF recommendation for a building project, it would be the most cost efficient to present that request prior to the start of the design stage of a project.

2. MASTER FACILITY PLAN PROJECT CYCLES

The meeting reconvened at 12:23 p.m.

Assistant Superintendent of Operations Paul Soares reviewed the PowerPoint presentation with the Board explaining what they can expect to see as the Master Facility Plan (MFP) unfolds over the next 15 years, terms they will most likely encounter as they see information about the MFP, and briefly reviewed the Office of Program Policy Analysis & Government Accountability (OPPAGA) audit (see attached in agenda). Director of Purchasing Terrence Wright reviewed the procurement process and its requirements. Mr. Soares then explained how continuing service contracts work, how they are different from regular service contracts, and when Board action will be required. The presentation concluded with Executive Director of Operations Byron Page showing the online dashboard for the District's website.

Board Member Questions:

- How frequently will it be updated?
    - That will depend on who is putting out the information
- When will it be available to the public?
    - Within 60 days, preferably sooner

- Are we notified, or responsible for conversations, during the "Cone of Silence" period of a Request for Qualification (RFQ)?
    - The burden is on the proposers not to engage in conversation with the Board Members, but Board Members have asked to be notified when RFQs are sent out.

Board Member Coker left the meeting at 1:00 p.m.

- Are goals being set by Office of Economic Opportunity? If so, are they being met?
    - Yes to both answers
- Will we have an increase in legal representation with the increase in contract work?
    - Yes. One attorney will be added to the contract work.
- Will this PowerPoint be shown to the Oversight Committee?
    - Yes

3. STRATEGIC PLAN

Mr. A.J. Crabill, Consultant with the Council of Great City Schools, joined the meeting via telephone to assist the Board in finalizing the goals and guiding principles for the Strategic Plan draft. Mr. Crabill explained that the Board needs to look closely at the wording for Goals. The Superintendent needs to look closely at the wording for Goal Progress Measures. After reviewing the draft document sent by Mr. Crabill (see attached in agenda), the Board did not make any major changes to the document, with the exception of Goal 3, although there were some minor changes they preferred in the wording.

GOAL 1 - Literacy
Goal Progress Measure 1.1 - Dr. Greene preferred that the wording that says "September 2026" be changed to read "EOY 2026."
Goal Progress Measure 1.3 - Typo saying 48% will be corrected to say 55%

GOAL 2 - School Grades of A, B. or C
No desired changes

GOAL 3 - DCPS Graduate/Diploma +
The Board had extensive conversation regarding the "plus" part of Diploma+. The plus represents course work centered around soft skills that many employers would like to see in youth that they hire coming out of high school. What the course work would look like is still to be determined along with whether it would be a requirement or elective and to which pathway students choose to pursue. The Superintendent and her staff will continue bringing it all into focus.

Assurance 1- Highly Effective Educators
No desired changes

Assurance 2 - Transparency with the Sales Surtax
The Board wanted to add language to the Assurance to clarify that transparency will be communicated to the community on a quarterly basis.

Assurance 3 - Family and Community Partnership Opportunities

The Board wants to add "that align with Strategic Plan goals" to the end of the language.

Assurance 4 - Support for Struggling Students
No desired changes

Assurance 5 - Culture and Climate that Improves the Academic, Social, and Emotional Development
Remove the word "the"

Next Steps
Mr. Crabill will work with staff to make the changes the Board wants and clean up the language. Chair Andersen clarified for the record that the Strategic Plan with its final edits would not be put out to the public for additional feedback; that doing so would delay the process by at least a month; however, it is important that the Board be mindful of what constituents have in the way of feedback once they have access to the plan.

Recess until 12:15 p.m.

4. GOVERNANCE

After watching the Board of Education meeting, Board Member Pearson drafted a letter to Commissioner Corcoran regarding the governor's position on priority vaccines. The Board agreed with writing the letter but felt it would be better to send it directly to Governor DeSantis and copy Commissioner Corcoran.

Board Member Joyce has had constituents contact her with concerns about transparency on the school name changing process; that there seemed to be some confusion about the dates of the community meetings. Some have asked that the high school community dates not overlap so that people can attend all of them. After meeting with the schools, Dr. Greene indicated that the challenge is only having three evenings that can be used each week since Wednesday and Friday evenings are usually tie up for most people. Dr. Greene said it would be possible to extend the process for the high schools out for an additional month to accommodate added community meetings. After talking with former Board Members that were on the Board at the time of the Nathan B. Forrest name change, she thinks it would be beneficial for the Board if they attend the meetings to strictly listen to the public's conversation on the topic. Board Member Jones agreed and reminded everyone that, according to Board policy, schools cannot be renamed after another person, living or deceased.

Board Member Willie left the meeting at 1:53 p.m.

Board Member Joyce asked if Jefferson Davis would still be in the school name changing process since the MFP would be changing it to a K-5 school. Dr. Greene indicated it will still be in the renaming process. Board Member Hershey asked who would be delivering the historical perspective of these schools since there can be different perspectives for the same thing. Also, will the conversation include how the Board made the decision on the names? Jacksonville University, University of North Florida, and Florida State College of Jacksonville all will give video presentations on the historical perspective. The remaining format of the presentations are still pending. A video of the meetings will be put on the District website as well as each individual school’s website for that school. The ballot locations will be at each school. There will be various methods for voting, such as walk in and drive thru. Identification will be required.

Board Member Hershey expressed her concern about a Board liaison being created for the Oversight Committee. She is concerned about the potential trouble it could cause the Board since its main purpose is to operate separate from the Board. Chair Andersen explained that the purpose of the Board liaison is simply a means by which the Oversight Committee can communicate to the Board like it would be for any other liaison created for any other group. It would not be necessary for that person to be present at the Oversight Committee meetings but would be the person the committee could contact should they need anything from the Board or have questions for the Board.

Board Member Joyce gave an update on where things stand with the Superintendent evaluation process and what is on the horizon. Ms. Chastain explained how the process for evaluating the Superintendent will work and recommended the Board have her do an agenda item that will waive Board policy regarding the Superintendent's evaluation tool being voted on by the end of June.

Board Member Joyce also gave an update on the status of the evaluation process for the Internal Auditor position.

Adjournment

1. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 2:21 p.m.

LBL

Superintendent

Chairman