Agenda

District Advisory Council

K.C. Wright, 600 SE 3rd Ave., Ft. Lauderdale, FL

March 13, 2019; 6:30 p.m. – 8:30 p.m. Boardroom

<http://browarddistrictadvisory.ch2v.com/>

Meeting called to order at 6:36 pm

**Mark your Calendars for DAC meetings** Apr. 10, May 8 Steering meetings Apr. 24, May 22, all at Plantation HS 7 p.m.

Approval of Minutes: February 13, 2019 approved as corrected.

**Topics:** Office of Service Quality (OSPA)

Donna Boruch – provided handout on the BCPS Parent Survey and advised of

Requested that SAF chairs emails so that the could be advised of the meetings. Requested of Dr. Wanza that principals have their SAF chairs attend the last three meetings of the year as quorum is needed to conduct business.

Introduced Dr. Wanza

Introduced Dr. Leo Nesmith – Office of Chief of Staff – request of Board to connect with advisories and to provide feedback on motions. Response time to report back to the advisories is estimated to be within 21 days.

Introduced Mr. Ed Hineline - Director IT and Vince Vinuza, director of technical support. Network Operations Center (NOC) monitors school’s activity throughout the day. Addressed the phone alert button and a speed dial.

Monday starting recertification to review what information is needed on their website. Certification goes through the same training along with why. IT is building into the culture of the training the importance of the information and keeping it up to date. Part of the training includes ADA. (i.e. Closed captioned, colors and documents). Schools have procedures/protocols and district has policies. This needs to be better defined at the school level. Quick links gives better control by the district versus putting it on a tab. Include this in certification training. Make ESE and Title I link is there. Staff looks at the websites for compliance.

Information can be relayed through Ed Hineline or PIO.

Zenia Santiago – Student Athletics – provided the booster guidelines handout. Incorporated suggestions made. Requested if anyone has sample bylaws. Providing financial information should be addressed on a seasonal as all sports do not run quarterly. Clarify number 20. Mandatory camps to be researched.

**Motion:** Move to form a subcommittee on Booster Clubs. Linda Ferrara, Carolyn Krohn.

 Veronica, Janet, Laura, Debbie, Beverly, Carolyn and Carol

Brian Katz – Chief Information Officer & Director – Discussion on metal detection. Static metal detections provide a level of deterrents not protection. From a security perspective the district wants to make sure they are getting a return on investment and which is actually deterring a level that is expected for the amount of expense we would be talking about per school. Things that need to be looked at are: How much earlier does the student have to be there; are we doing this for a purpose; are the goals going to be achieved to limit weapons on campus? Also, professionals performing these activities not just anybody waving a wand. The initial plan being proposed is dynamic metal detection instead of static meta detection. Deploying resources from SIU and local police departments that are cooperating, in an appearingly random fashion to schools. This will be done with a focus on communicating out to parents and students and they shouldn’t be bringing this stuff to school. In the course of the random metal detection and bag search they find something that is considered contraband within the school, there will be consequences that come with these searches.

The deterrent factor starts at home with parents checking bags to make sure that they are going to school with appropriate materials. What this may look like is buses arriving and SIU saying everyone from this particular bus will step into an area to be screened the goal is not 100% screening, but to provide a certain level of deterrence that you would get from a metal detection but at a much lower cost and at a higher effectiveness. The likelihood of finding something goes up higher than with the metal detection. TSA data shows that the failure rate is 80% to 85% from metal detection. In addition, these teams would be used for targeted metal detection, i.e. we had a threat, we said we increased the security at a particular school and deploy those resources to those schools as well. This would not be random but risk based. From the safety and security perspective is trying to strike a balance of public request to bring metal detection into the schools, but at the same tie trying to strike a balance where it isn’t such an impact on the students themselves and the ability to keep the schedule for the day. Mr. Katz is requesting feedback on any questions or concerns we have to improve the process.

Some suggestions already considered is using certified law enforcement personnel who have been through that training as campus security personnel would have to go through a training first. Looking to make this appear as a random process. It may start out as every seven kids, then 10 and so on. Trying to make that the bias is kept out of the selection. The supervisor will determine the random selection sequence that morning.

Starting at high school level, then incorporating middle schools. Elementary would be police engagement, but this process has not been defined yet. Parents will not have the option to opt out because the law says all that is needed is reasonable suspicion to search any child, property or vehicle on school grounds. Special needs and medical concerns are being addressed.

Will need to look at counselors and how they engage in this process.

Parents need to be alerted when items are found.

Need to pilot at all levels. Prior to roll out there will be engagement with administration to understand that when this happens there are things that may affect them. Committee members include principals. One of the suggestions received would be using K-9’s for car searches if necessary, but is not being looked at immediately.

Educating parents on what this will involve once their child is screened and other items confiscated. There may be piloting before the end of the school year depending on feedback and ability to roll it out.

**Safer Spaces – Board approved policy. Rolled out some initial guidance. Not a catchall or save all for all security in the classroom. It is a tool for certain circumstances.**

**Contact: brian.katz@browardschools.com**

**Motions**:

Students from Western High School provided a handout on Student Working Against Tobacco (SWAT) and a presentation on cigarettes and e-cigarettes.

**Current language:** II. Definitions: B. “*Electronic cigarette (e-cigarette)* means any oral device that provides a vapor of liquid nicotine, lobelia, and/or other substances, and the use or inhalation of which simulates smoking. The term shall include any such devices, whether they are manufactured, distributed, marketed or sold as e-cigarette, e-cigars, e-pipes, or under any other product name or descriptor.”

**Motion to replace the following definition in policy 2401, II B with:**

 **Vapes means any oral device, including Electronic Nicotine Delivery Systems (ENDS), that could be used ~~that is used intended~~ to inhale a vapor of any substance, including substances composed without nicotine.**

**ENDS means any oral device that provides a vapor of liquid nicotine and the use or inhalation of which simulates smoking. Both vapes and ENDS shall include any such devices, whether they are manufactured, distributed, marketed or sold as e-cigarette, e-cigars, e-pipes, Juuls, Suorins, or any other product name or descriptor. Linda Ferrara, Andrea Blackwood.**

**Passed Unanimously**

**MOTION from North Area**

**Whereas the School Board can take an undetermined amount of time to acknowledge and decide on motions presented by DAC, motion to require the School Board to reply, in writing, within 60 days to all motions presented to them by DAC. Jeff Gold, Beverly Motion passes 17 yes, 4 no**

Additional discussion was had on signage in more obvious places along with making the school a Smoke Free zone.

**Old Business Motion to accept** Policy 1.2 as amended. Passed unanimously

Amended Duties: **require the School Board to reply, in writing, within 60 days to all motions presented to them by DAC.** Passed unanimously



**New Business**

**Nominations Committee: Linda Ferrara, Carolyn Krohn and Melina Markos**

**Feedback Professional Study Days**

1.  How many schools exercise the PSD option?  (How many days do most of the school elect to use?)

2.  What exactly is defined in the policy as the appropriate use of PSD time?

3.  Do the schools meet these standards?

4.  Is there any way to evaluate that this time makes a difference in the student learning?

5.  How do we substantiate the PSD is of greater benefit vs. the lost hours of classroom learning? (How much less learning or teachable hours is there based on the days of PSD a school takes?)

6.  How many teachers leave early on these days?

7.  Do less students attend school on PSD days across the county?

8.  How many PSD days fall on the FTE days where attendance is looked at for the state, appropriated monies?

School Attendance:

1.  How many teachable days are there in a school calendar year?  (Meaning has the district looked at full, uninterrupted days?  The week of Thanksgiving?)  Testing days are not true teachable days, take your student to work day is not a teachable day.

2.  On half days, does the attendance of the student population drop?  By how many?

3.  Do PSD days decrease the number of students who attend school?

4.  What other factors that affect attendance in our schools?

**Feedback needed on the ID badge process.**

**Adjourn 8:42 pm**