

**Rochester Board of Education**  
**Finance Committee**  
**March 19, 2013**

**Attendance:** Commissioner Powell (Chair) – arrived 5:46PM; Commissioners White, Adams and Cruz (arrived 5:36PM). Parent Representative: Giancarlo Giannini. District Staff: Bill Ansbro, Chief Financial Officer; Vern Connors, Budget Director; Gary Smith, Purchasing Officer; Michael Schmidt, Chief of Operations; and Annmarie Lehner, Information Technology Officer. Board Staff: Debra Flanagan.

Since Commissioner Powell was delayed, Commissioner Cruz initially chaired and convened the meeting at 5:43PM.

**I. Question & Answer Session**

Bill Ansbro reported that the NYS legislature is expected to approve the 2013-14 NYS budget within the next few days. He stated that the Superintendent's presentation of the proposed 2013-14 RCSD budget was postponed until Monday, March 25<sup>th</sup>, in anticipation of approval of the NYS budget. Mr. Ansbro noted that pension smoothing and additional NYS Aid in the final NYS budget will have a significant impact on the District.

Mr. Ansbro described meeting with City officials today to begin collaborative capital planning, specifically with regard to upgrade of athletic fields and projects for 2013-14. He stated that additional opportunities for collaboration with the City will be pursued.

**II. Review and Approve Minutes of February 12, 2013 Finance Committee Meeting**

**Motion** by Commissioner White to approve the minutes of the February 12, 2013 Finance Committee meeting. Seconded by Commissioner Powell. **Adopted 3-0, with concurrence of parent representative.**

**III. Review and Approve February 2013 Financial Report**

Mr. Ansbro stated that there has been no significant variation from the January 2013 Financial Report.

Commissioner White inquired about mid-year funding reductions to program budgets, such as the Rochester Teen Court. He stated that he had heard of a reduction in this program budget from \$50K to \$15K, and asked about the rationale for the funding reduction and whether the Administration makes amendments to budgetary contracts in mid-year. Mr. Ansbro replied that the funding reduction by the District is to match the funds that the City will provide to the Rochester Teen Court program (\$7500). He explained that each contract renewal is carefully evaluated to determine whether it supports the core mission of the District, and funds have been redirected to support the Common Core curriculum and APPR. Mr. Ansbro noted that the

Rochester Teen Court was originally funded by the State, which withdrew their funding over the years and left the financial support to RCSD and the City.

Commissioner Powell asked whether the change in program funding is for a contract or an amended budget, noting that budget amendments are not typically made in March.

Commissioner White objected to the Administration reducing funds for the Rochester Teen Court simply because the City chose to do so, as the District has different priorities than the City. He requested information about the extent to which RCSD is making funding decisions based on matching the amount of the City's contribution. Commissioner White expressed concern about directing funding to the Common Core because the District must consider and evaluate all student needs. He stated that the City initially funded the Rochester Teen Court under former Mayor Bill Johnson, and asserted that the \$35K taken from this program will do little to contribute to the Common Core curriculum. Commissioner White underscored the importance of the Rochester Teen Court as an effective preventive program, and that quantifying results for preventive efforts can be problematic. He requested that Mr. Ansbro follow up in obtaining further information about the rationale and impetus for the funding reduction for the Teen Court program, particularly in light of the comments he has presented.

Commissioner White asked about other contracts for which funds have been redirected to the Common Core, as well as information regarding the dollar amounts involved in each of these contracts. He expressed concern that certain contracts are being targeted.

**Action Item: Mr. Ansbro will provide information to the members of the Finance Committee regarding the specific contracts for which funds have been reallocated for the Common Core curriculum, with a breakdown as to the amount of each of these contracts.**

Mr. Ansbro stated that there was a contract regarding college readiness that was discontinued because it was not cost effective in terms of outcomes or cost per student. He emphasized the need to evaluate every contract in terms of cost effectiveness and alignment with the District's mission.

Commissioner Powell pointed out that the contract for the RIT Middle College program (i.e. college readiness) had not been submitted to the Finance Committee for review before it was sent to the full Board for a vote. She objected to continuation of this practice with the Rochester Teen Court, since it was not included in this meeting's agenda and is planned to be sent to the full Board for a vote in the upcoming March Business meeting.

Commissioner White asked about protocol for obtaining Board input when funding changes are made, particularly when the Board had previously approved the contract or line item in the budget.

Mr. Ansbro replied that the threshold for Board review of contracts is \$35K, so the original contract for \$50K would have been subject to Board review and approval. He stated that the amended contract for the Rochester Teen Court is less than \$35K, and therefore below the threshold for Board review.

Commissioner White contended that the agreement for the Rochester Teen Court does not involve a new contract, but an amendment to an existing contract and therefore should be reviewed by the Finance Committee prior to submission to the Board.

**Action Item:** Mr. Ansbrow will confirm whether the change in funding for the Center for Youth Services for the Rochester Teen Court involves a new contract or an amended contract, and report this information to the members of the Finance Committee.

Commissioner Cruz reported that Board members have been receiving calls from community members and organizations with concerns about RCSD contracts. He emphasized the need for the District to improve communications with contractors to explain actions clearly so that the rationale can be understood. He stated that this confusion or misunderstanding hinders the District's relationships with community organizations, particularly those that have been its traditional partners. Mr. Ansbrow replied that an important aspect of closing the 2013-14 budget gap was to re-evaluate and reduce funding for some of the District's vendor contracts.

**Motion** by Commissioner White to approve February 2013 Financial Report. Seconded by Commissioner Cruz. **Adopted 3-0, with concurrence of parent representative.**

#### **IV. Review of Resolutions for March 28, 2013 Board Business Meeting**

##### **A. BUDGET**

- 1. New York State Non-Resident Tuition Rates for 2012-13 – Resolution No. 2012-13: 520**

**Motion** by Commissioner Cruz to approve above resolution regarding 2012-13 Non-Resident Tuition rates. Seconded by Commissioner White. **Adopted 3-0, with concurrence of parent representative.**

##### **B. PROCUREMENT & SUPPLY**

- 1. Lightspeed Technologies Inc.; Oticon Inc.; Phonak LLC (dba “Phonak Hearing Systems”); Tequipment – contracts for audiology supplies and equipment – Resolution No. 2012-13: 521**

**Motion** by Commissioner Cruz to approve above Procurement resolution. Seconded by Commissioner White. **Adopted 3-0, with concurrence of parent representative.**

##### **C. FACILITIES**

###### **Contracts:**

- 1. Steve General Contractor, Inc. – general construction work; Pipitone Enterprises, LLC – HVAC work; Leo J. Roth – plumbing work; Eastcoast Electric, LLC – electrical work; Jupiter Environmental Services, Inc. – asbestos abatement work; TES Environmental Corp. – air monitoring work: contracts for renovation of School No. 39 – Resolution No. 2012-13: 522**

2. **Difiore Construction, Inc. – site work; Steve General Contractor, Inc. – general construction work; Pipitone Enterprises – HVAC work; Nairy Mechanical, LLC – plumbing work; Hewitt Young Electric, LLC – electrical work: contracts for renovation of East High School – Resolution No. 2012-13: 523**
3. **Kuitems Construction, Inc. – general construction work: contract for renovation of School No. 10 and 33 – Resolution No. 2012-13: 524**
4. **A.M. Stern, Inc. – general construction work; Lozier Environmental Consulting, Inc. – air monitoring work: contracts for renovation of Franklin High School – Resolution No. 2012-13: 525**
5. **FW Construction Corporation of Rochester – general construction work; Nairy Mechanical, LLC – plumbing work; Hewitt Young Electric, LLC – electrical work: contracts for renovation of School No. 6 – Resolution No. 2012-13: 526**
6. **Steve General Contractor, Inc. – general construction work; Lloyd Mechanical Co., LLC – HVAC work; Nairy Mechanical, LLC – plumbing work; Eastcoast Electric, LLC – electrical work: contracts for renovation of School No. 9 and Baden Street Recreation Center – Resolution No. 2012-13: 527**
7. **Kuitems Construction, Inc. – general construction work; Envoy Environmental Consultants, Inc. – air monitoring work; Unified Mechanical Contractors, Inc. – plumbing work; Pipitone Enterprises, LLC – mechanical work; Eastcoast Electric, LLC – electrical work: contracts for renovation of School No. 34 – Resolution No. 2012-13: 528**
8. **Kuitems Construction, Inc. – general construction work; Envoy Environmental Consultants, Inc. – air monitoring work; WYCO Mechanical, LLC – plumbing work; Leo J. Roth Corporation – mechanical work; Eastcoast Electric, LLC – electrical work: contracts for renovation of School No. 2 – Resolution No. 2012-13: 529**
9. **Elmer W. Davis, Inc. – roofing work; Pipitone Enterprises, LLC – HVAC work; Eastcoast Electric, LLC – electrical work: contracts for renovation of School No. 1 – Resolution No. 2012-13: 530**
10. **Kuitems Construction, Inc. – general construction work; Lloyd Mechanical Co. – HVAC work; Lloyd Mechanical Co. – plumbing work; Concord Electric, LLC – electrical work; Lozier Environmental Consulting, Inc. – air monitoring work: contracts for renovation of School No. 44 – Resolution No. 2012-13: 531**

11. **S&W Contracting of Western New York – general construction work; Leo J. Roth Corporation – HVAC work; Leo J. Roth Corporation – plumbing work; Eastcoast Electric, LLC – electrical work; Mark Cerrone, Inc. – asbestos abatement work; TES Environmental Corporation – air monitoring work: contracts for renovation of Wilson Foundation and Wilson Commencement Academies – Resolution No. 2012-13: 532**
12. **Testa Construction Inc. – general construction work; Crosby-Brownie, Inc. – HVAC work; Unified Mechanical Contractors, Inc. – plumbing work; Concord Electric Corporation – electrical work; TES Environmental Corporation – air monitoring work: contracts for renovation of the Douglass campus – Resolution No. 2012-13: 533**
13. **The Pike Company – general construction work; Thurston Dudek, LLC – plumbing work: contracts for renovation of Charlotte High School – Resolution No. 2012-13: 534**

Commissioner Powell pointed out that the reason for the large number of Facilities contracts at this time is due to a backlog of work that could not be performed when the City did not issue bonds to finance RCSD capital projects. At that time, the City was concerned that additional debt would increase their annual payment to the District (i.e. Maintenance of Effort – MOE payment). Commissioner Powell noted that some of the capital projects in the above resolutions are not contained in the Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) for 2011-12 or 2012-13, such as renovations to School No. 2, Douglass campus, and Charlotte High School. Mike Schmidt explained that \$300K was designated in the 2012-13 CIP for K-8 growout models, and these funds were later assigned to renovating School No. 2.

With regard to renovations of the Douglass campus, Mr. Schmidt stated that the 2011-12 CIP used contingency funds (Cash Capital) to support projects because of the unresolved MOE issue at that time. He explained that the City has resumed issuing bonds with resolution of the MOE issue, and additional funds have been reallocated to renovate the Douglass campus. He stated that the costs contained in the resolution are for the remainder of the work needed.

**Action Item: Mr. Schmidt will confirm that the resolution for renovation of the Douglass campus (Resolution No. 2012-13: 533) is for funds reallocated since resolution of the MOE issue, and the dollar amount reflects the cost of the work remaining to be performed.**

With regard to the resolution for renovation of Charlotte High School, Mr. Schmidt noted that this involves an additional allocation because this work was not included in the Facilities Master Plan (FMP), but is necessary to support the improvements planned under the FMP.

Commissioner Powell inquired about the source of the funds for these projects, since they were not included in the CIP. Mr. Ansbrow recalled that \$7.5M in accumulated savings from capital projects coming in under budget over the years was used to fund projects when the City was not issuing bonds. He stated that when the City resumed issuing bonds for 2011-12 and 2012-13 projects, the \$7.5M was replaced and became available for other projects. Mr. Ansbrow stated that he reported to the Board and to City Council about the specific projects that would be funded with this allocation, which included the roof for Charlotte High School.

Mr. Schmidt stated that there are a total of 13 resolutions for capital improvements: 5 projects from 2011-12, 7 from 2012-13, and 6 planned for the future from the 2012-13 CIP. He stated that the \$7.5M reallocation will be used for renovation of Charlotte High School (\$2M) and \$5.5M for other work planned for the summer of 2014.

Commissioner Adams noted that renovations to School No. 16 were removed from the 2012-13 CIP, and emphasized the need to consider how these funds will be reallocated. She stated that the Board did not approve a waiver for use of these funds, and underscored the need for the Board to be given information as to how these funds will be used. Commissioner Adams also emphasized the importance of providing the CIP to the Board early in the budget deliberation process.

Commissioner Powell pointed out that the CIP has been delivered to the Board later and later in the budget deliberation process over the last few years, and requested that it be provided by the first or second budget meeting this year.

**Motion** by Commissioner Cruz to approve above Facilities contract resolutions. Seconded by Commissioner White. **Adopted 3-0, with concurrence of parent representative.**

**Final Payments:**

- 14. Hewitt Young Electrical, LLC – final payment for electrical work for renovation of School No. 16 and 44 – Resolution No. 2012-13: 535**
- 15. Lloyd Mechanical Co., LLC – final payment for plumbing work for renovation of School No. 16 and 44 – Resolution No. 2012-13: 536**
- 16. Lloyd Mechanical Co., LLC – plumbing work for renovation of School No. 46 – Resolution No. 2012-13: 537**
- 17. McMullen Bishop Inc. (dba “NorthEastern Electrical”) – electrical work for renovation of School No. 58 – Resolution No. 2012-13: 538**

**18. Eastcoast Electric, LLC – electrical work for renovation of School No. 46 – Resolution No. 2012-13: 539**

**Motion** by Commissioner White to address all above Facilities final payment resolutions as a group. Seconded by Commissioner Cruz. **Adopted 3-0, with concurrence of parent representative.**

**Motion** by Commissioner White to approve all above Facilities final payment resolutions. Seconded by Commissioner Cruz. **Adopted 3-0, with concurrence of parent representative.**

**Other:**

**19. SWBR Architects – correction in project cost from Resolution No. 2012-13: 473 from \$536,464 to \$536,646 – Resolution No. 2012-13: 540**

**Motion** by Commissioner Cruz to approve above resolution to correct the project cost with SWBR Architects. Seconded by Commissioner White. **Adopted 3-0, with concurrence of parent representative.**

**20. Hess Corporation – contract to supply and deliver natural gas for use at District facilities – Resolution No. 2012-13: 541**

**Motion** by Commissioner White to approve above resolution for contract with Hess Corporation for natural gas. Seconded by Commissioner Cruz. **Adopted 3-0, with concurrence of parent representative.**

**21. Adoption of March 2013 Facilities Master Plan, which includes closure of the following facilities housing: School No. 10, No. 22, No. 25, No. 36, and No. 54 – Resolution No. 2012-13: 542**

Commissioner Powell stated that the Facilities Master Plan was discussed in last week's Board Work Session. She pointed out that the key question is whether the proposed school closures have to be considered as a package, or can be evaluated separately – particularly with regard to closing School No. 10.

Commissioner Powell expressed concern about declaring that a building is no longer a part of the educational system because the District will lose claim to the property. She noted that the building housing School No. 10 is located on prime real estate, and suggested that the Board may want to delay closing the facility to consider alternative uses for the property.

Commissioner White pointed out that the facilities will not actually be closed for years (i.e. 2020-21 for School No. 10) and the City could not lay claim to this property until then.

Commissioner Powell responded that once the Board has made a decision regarding the FMP, the Administration objects to any reconsideration in the future. She stated that the opportunity for reconsideration then becomes an issue of contention.

Commissioner Adams commented on the rationale presented in the detailed report developed by Facilities staff, in which the buildings housing School Nos. 22, 25, 36, and 44 were identified as “strong candidates for retirement” and School No. 10 was not included in this list. She voiced concern about approving the Plan as a whole because many aspects seem to be essentially political choices, rather than based on a rational analysis of facility investment. Commissioner Adams also contended that the Board has not discussed most of the proposed Facilities Master Plan, but will bear responsibility for it. She asserted that the current proposed Plan contains many inequities, such as making the building housing School No. 30 the permanent site for School No. 54. Commissioner Adams contended that it will be a betrayal of the students of School No. 30 and of the community if the District does not meet assurances that these students will be able to attend their neighborhood school. She stated that School No. 30 is a valued neighborhood school, vital to the community and serves a high population of special needs students. Commissioner Adams questioned whether the leadership and staff of School No. 54 will embrace this neighborhood.

Commissioner White stated that he has asked a number of times about the use of School No. 6, but has not yet received a response from the Administration. He suggested considering tabling this resolution to allow additional time for the Board to examine the implications.

Commissioner Powell inquired about the consequences of tabling or failing to approve this resolution at this time. Mr. Schmidt replied that NYSED has stated that a minimum of five facilities must be closed to avoid jeopardizing future phases of the Facilities Modernization Plan (FMP).

Commissioner Powell objected to this line of reasoning, stating that NYSED cannot threaten to compromise future phases of the FMP because any future phases must be approved in legislation – not through NYSED. She asked about the timeframe in which NYSED expects the District to act.

Mr. Ansbro emphasized that the way in which RCSD manages closure of school facilities will affect legislation approving future phases of the FMP. He noted that NYSED has already expressed concerns about the administrative costs entailed in Phase I, which will have to be addressed to prevent significant reductions in the reimbursement rate for costs in future phases. Mr. Ansbro stated that closing school facilities is the first step in the process, and the second step is designing plans according to the lessons learned in the first phase.

Commissioner Adams stated that Chuck Szeberla at NYSED advised RCSD to collaborate and use their expertise to obtain the best outcome. She contended that

the District has an obligation to involve NYSED, particularly with regard to renovating a facility identified as a strong candidate for retirement (School No. 44) and closing a facility that is more cost effective to renovate (School No. 10).

Commissioner White stated that the Committee should recommend that the Board table this resolution and conduct a meeting of the whole or Work Session to examine the school facility closures more fully.

Commissioner Cruz inquired about opportunities to involve Chuck Szeberla in these discussions because of his expertise and to confirm the timeframe for making these decisions. He pointed out that every school community has passionate support, but decisions have to be made by the Board. He expressed concern about the implications of delaying these decisions.

Commissioner Powell noted that progress has been made in that there is apparent agreement about the plans for closing three of the schools proposed in the Facilities Master Plan. She emphasized the responsibility of the Board in making these decisions and being confident about their implications.

**Motion** by Commissioner White to recommend that the Board table the resolution regarding proposed closure of school facilities until additional information is obtained from NYSED and the Board has had an opportunity to evaluate this measure more fully. **Adopted 3-0, with concurrence of parent representative.**

Commissioner Powell emphasized the need to reach a decision within the next few weeks because of the impact on the 2013-14 CIP and budget.

**Action Item: Ms. Flanagan will work with the Board Clerk to schedule a meeting or Work Session to discuss the Facilities Master Plan within the next two weeks.**

#### **D. INFORMATION MANAGEMENT & TECHNOLOGY**

##### **1. Florida Virtual School – purchase of four perpetual licenses for Virtual Advanced Placement (VAP) classes in support of the Rochester eLearning platform – Resolution No. 2012-13: 543**

Commissioner Powell inquired whether purchase of perpetual licenses is the same as owning the software for these online Advanced Placement (AP) courses. Tim Cliby responded that it is essentially the same, although the District would not be able to sell the software. He also noted that if there are changes to the courses in the future, the District will have to pay a fee to obtain the upgraded content.

Commissioner Adams expressed concern about the District's reliance on technology as a method of instruction, particularly since research has not supported the effectiveness of online instruction. She requested rigorous empirical research

regarding virtual classes and data regarding RCSD online credit recovery to support the request to utilize this instructional method. Commissioner Adams urged her colleagues to continue to question this instructional approach.

Mr. Cliby reported that the District has received a State grant to increase the accessibility of AP classes to students, and online instruction is the most cost effective mechanism. He stated that only one of the four AP courses is currently offered District-wide, and there has not been sufficient enrollment for the other three courses at any one location to justify 1FTE for a teacher. Mr. Cliby pointed out that another 17 groups in the State are developing online courses, and these resources will be available to the District in a State-wide repository. He noted that many states and colleges currently require students to have experience with online courses. He explained that the comprehensive virtual AP courses available through Florida Virtual School can readily be incorporated into the District's e-learning platform. Mr. Cliby stated that virtual online classes can also be provided to students in charter schools, home schooled, and in other districts to generate revenue for RCSD.

Commissioner Adams emphasized that the virtual AP courses are only cost effective if the instruction is effective, and noted that the Board requested data regarding RCSD students' experience and performance with online credit recovery classes. Mr. Cliby replied that he has not seen this request, but offered to provide data regarding the number of credits recovered, number/percentage of students who recovered credits through the online classes, and the percentage that passed Regents exams.

**Action Item: Mr. Cliby will provide data to the Board regarding the performance of students who have taken online credit recovery classes, specifically with regard to the number of credits recovered, the number/percentage of students who recovered credits, and the number/percentage of these students who passed Regents exams. Data will be provided for the 2011-12 school year and for the current school year as of January 2013.**

Parent Representative Giancarlo Giannini asked which AP courses would be offered online. Mr. Cliby responded that online AP courses are to be offered in Art History, Computer Science, Psychology, and Literature and Composition. He noted that each of these courses will involve RCSD teachers, and will require teacher time with students.

Commissioner White inquired whether the teacher's time with students would be in a classroom or via computer. Mr. Cliby replied that students would be given times to log onto the computer to access a "live" class or at other times to have online contact with a teacher.

Commissioner White voiced concern about the potential profit to be made from virtual classes and questioned whether this might drive some of the momentum for online instruction. He emphasized the need to exert greater oversight in making these educational decisions for this reason.

Commissioner White also pointed out that the idea of virtual classes should have been vetted through the Board's Excellence in Student Achievement Committee to conduct an in-depth examination of the potential impact on students. He noted that this analysis should also indicate the different types of students for which online instruction is most likely to be effective.

Mr. Cliby reported that the State has asked for a commitment from the District because the grant funds have been awarded. He stated that all Information Management & Technology resolutions are required to be submitted to the Finance Committee for review.

Commissioner White recommended that this proposal be vetted more fully through the Excellence in Student Achievement Committee or by the full Board.

Commissioner Powell inquired about the total amount of the grant award. Mr. Cliby stated that the grant began in January 2013 and will end in June 2014, for a total amount of \$750K. He reported that the funds will be used toward 1FTE of a teachers' time in 2012-13 and 2013-14 to write and plan the curriculum and for staff training on AP and virtual instruction. Mr. Cliby explained that all four of the virtual AP classes must be delivered by AP teachers and the students must have taken specific prerequisites and be close to graduation (i.e. 10<sup>th</sup> through 12<sup>th</sup> grades). He stated that resolutions will be presented to the Board in the near future for additional pay for these teachers, so that they can perform this work over the summer and to provide a 20% stipend to AP teachers because they will be teaching more than five courses. He noted that two sections will be offered for each of the four AP courses, with a maximum of 20 students in each class.

Commissioner Powell asked how the decision was made to offer these specific four AP courses online, particularly since the School of the Arts already offers an AP Art History class. Mr. Cliby responded that only AP Literature and Composition is currently offered throughout the District, and the other AP courses are only offered in one or two locations.

Commissioner Powell questioned the rationale for purchasing the online courses from the Florida Virtual School, while also paying teachers to develop and modify the classes. She asked why the virtual AP classes could not simply be developed in-house by District staff. Mr. Cliby responded that these online courses are quite comprehensive and could not be completely constructed in-house to be ready by August 2013.

Commissioner Powell stated that she takes issue with the cost and expected value of this project in light of the average teacher's pay and the untested nature of these virtual courses. She also objected to the grant funds being incorporated into the budget because this appears as though the District expends exorbitant amounts of funds for little return, and the virtual courses would not contribute to the core mission of graduating students. She suggested that students would be better off taking classes

at Monroe Community College, which would also be more cost effective. Mr. Cliby replied that paying for students to take classes at MCC would not offer the same opportunities because the NYS grant provides access to all RCSD teachers to the materials/courses developed by the other 17 programs in the State.

Commissioner Powell asserted that the District already has the Rochester Area Interactive Telecommunications Network (RAITN) Rooms at East High School and on the Franklin campus. Mr. Cliby responded that those RAITN Rooms have been dismantled, with the room at Franklin having been turned into an ESL room for School No. 58. He stated that while the RAITN Rooms were a great resource at the time, the electronics were outdated and the current RCSD network provides greater capability in terms of bandwidth delivery. Mr. Cliby also pointed out that current technology provides the same type of functionality as the RAITN Rooms, but the technology is now mobile and can be transported to different classrooms and schools. He pointed out that the District will have access to materials developed in 17 programs in two years, and all of the other Big Five districts are participating except Syracuse.

Commissioner Powell asked about the consequences of tabling this resolution at this point. Mr. Cliby replied that the Department of Instructional Technology has already expended considerable time and effort on this initiative. He stated that tabling the resolution will delay implementation because teachers will not be able to begin developing the online courses. He also noted that the grant will provide students with a laptop and Internet service.

Commissioner Cruz noted that this resolution has many implications and advised that it be vetted through the Excellence in Student Achievement Committee to ensure full examination and support by the Board, staff, and community.

**Motion** by Commissioner White to recommend to the Board that this resolution be tabled and referred to the Excellence in Student Achievement Committee for further examination. Seconded by Commissioner Cruz. **Adopted 3-0, with concurrence of parent representative.**

**Motion** by Commissioner Cruz to adjourn. Seconded by Commissioner White. **Adopted 3-0, with concurrence of parent representative.**

Meeting adjourned at 7:47PM.