Board Member Questions (September 8, 2026 Regular Meeting)

Agenda Items	Question	Response
6. REPORTS		
A. Superintendent Update Academic Achievement and Growth B. Communications Plan	A) the fact that a principal advisory committee has been formed (and that Dr. Licata has met with them) for the purpose of getting direct feedback from on-campus leaders and that the feedback received will be used to make changes geared toward supporting teachers and staff. Something along the lines of "we hear and understand that a lot of teachers are feeling fearful and overwhelmed and we are actively working to implement changes that will make those teachers feel supported and confident." B) the fact that teachers on non-elevate campuses have the autonomy to deviate from the timed slides when necessary—that does not mean they can scrap the lesson plan, but they are not required to be on time down to the second. If a child needs a minute or two of one-on-one, teachers have the ability to provide it without worrying about being written up. If they are being written up for doing the things necessary to bring kids along, that is no ok. — My thought here is that the teachers and public need to hear to the district clearly communicate on this front. What I just wrote is exactly what I have been told is the situation—our non-elevate teachers have the autonomy to deviate from the scripted slides when necessary. If that is true (and I am sure that it is since that is how it was communicated to me), let's go on record and make things clear. And, if our middle management folks (who are doing observations) are not clear on this fact, we need to remedy that as well. C) along those same lines—talk about the formation and action of the SLP advisory committee and note that there will be a vote tonight to immediately put over $2.5M dollars to work to fill open SLP and other specialists' positions within the district. It is important for the public to know that Dr. Licata and his team are directly working with staff—listening and taking action in response. Item B on Reports — What does "Communications Plan" mean? Do we have one? Is Dr. Licata going to set a deadline for us to have one? I was under the impression that we would have the plan by now, but I do not believe I have seen a draft. I am just looking for clarity in terms of what this "Report" is about.	A) We are extremely thankful for the input and participation of the following school principals. They are now a part of the monthly principal advisory group with the Superintendent. The School Principals include: Katie Myers Alice, Alexandra Montes, Sandra Haro, Xavier Smith, Deliecia McGee, Janae Capshaw, Elizabeth Kels, Hilda Herrera, Baldwin Brown, Jason Oliver, Manny DeLaCruz, Carla Leejay, Jareem Williams, Cathy Williams Ridley, Melissa Strom, Rediesha Allen, Angelica Casteneda, and Jessica Leavitt. These principals provided critical input for the Superintendent and team. They will be an integral part of the decision-making process for the Cabinet Members moving forward. Our team is thankful for the opportunity to hear the concerns and provide direct answers on how to move forward in a positive way. B) Dr. Soliz and Mr. Chodhury are in the process of developing a fact page for all staff. Dr. Soliz meets weekly with all regional executive directors to establish a single message surrounding earned autonomy and what that means for the designated campuses, as well as expectations for all campuses, including ELEVATE network campuses. C) Dr. Kushner met with several SLP to form an advisory committee led by Max Pell, SLP. SLP on this committee call included Emily Cambron, Kellie Cullen, Saqouia Layton, Janay McKinney, Max Pell, Nathaniel Schug, and Elizabeth Surita-Khuat. The first meeting took place on 8/27/26 at the discussion was helpful and insightful. Additional considerations are under review by the Superintendent and his cabinet surrounding ways to incentivize and retain SLP. Regarding the contract extension item for contracted services, these funds are currently in the budget tied to current SLP Vacant Positions. In order to ensure direct services to students are not interrupted, this item utilizes funds attached to current vacant positions to increase contracted services while still recruiting for FWISD employed SLP. As of 9/4, the district has secured 94.7 SLP through a combination of district employed SLP (67) and additional 27.7 positions through contracted services.
8. CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS		
Legal, Sidney Pounds, General Counsel		
B. Approve Outside Employment for District Administrators (H.B. 3372) 15 Outside Employment Septem ber 2026.docx 2	Consent Agenda Item B on Consent — I believe this pertains to the teacher who also teaches one class at TCC and is requesting a waiver? We received her request a while back in a separate email, but it was not part of the supporting documents for the agenda, so I am making sure that is what is up for vote. Please confirm. Or, if there are multiple employees seeking approval for outside employment please let me know.	The BOE received supporting documents for this item on the BOE Updates on 8/28 and 9/4. There is one employee seeing approval. We are unaware of the teacher who sent a request to the BOE via email. During the 89th Legislative Session, the Texas Legislature passed H.B. 3372, directly impacting District administrators. The legislation, which is currently in effect, prohibits District administrators from receiving any financial benefit for the performance of personal services for certain entities, including: 1. Any business entity that does business with the administrator’s employing district (Fort Worth ISD); 2. An education business providing curriculum or administration services to any ISD; or 3. Another ISD, Education Service Center, or Open Enrollment Charter School. The law defines an “administrator” as any employee who has significant administrative duties relating to the operation of the district, including the operation of a campus, program, or other subdivision of the district. This may include assistant principals, principals, directors, executive directors, etc. The bill specifically excludes classroom teachers and District Board of Education trustees from its scope.

Agenda Items	Question	Response
C. Approve Annual Certification of Compliance with Certain Laws Pursuant to SB 12 17 and Tex. Edu. Code Sec. 39.008 SB 12 Annual Certification.docx FWISD SB 12 Certification Form.pdf	Consent Agenda Item C on Consent — Are there redlines showing the policy changes that were required to come into compliance with the law? If so, can those be made part of the supporting documents for the agenda? I understand that the law is the law and we had to make changes to comply, but the "Certification of Compliance" document that is up for vote only provides short summaries of changes—making it impossible to see what was actually changed. For the purposes of transparency and full understanding, I would like to see the actual changes that were made — and think they should be included in the published supporting documents for the agenda.	Per legal, Sid Pounds can provide the supporting document provided by TASB prior to the meeting. A summary will be sent to all board members.
	SB 12 DEI Compliance Certification (Consent Item C) Before SB 12, what specific programs, staff duties, or professional development activities existed to support equity for at-risk or historically underserved students — and which of those were discontinued, renamed, or restructured to comply? How is the district distinguishing between prohibited "DEI duties" and permitted work addressing achievement gaps or serving at-risk populations — is there written guidance staff can rely on?	Per legal, Sid Pounds can provide the supporting document provided by TASB prior to the meeting. A summary will be sent to all board members.
Business and Finance		
D. Accept the Calculations of the No-New Revenue Tax Rate and Voter-Approval Tax Rate for the Tax Year 2026 for the Fort Worth Independent School District No-New-Revenue Tax Rate Calculations.docx 2026 T RC Worksheet-Fort Worth ISD.pdf 2 21	Items D and E on Consent — Line 5 on pg 22 of the supporting docs says that last year's "total adopted tax rate" was $1.029100. Line 26 on pg 24 says that the "Current Year NNR Tax Rate" is $1.029687—slightly higher than last years. However, the resolution we are being asked to vote on per page 30 of the supporting docs has the rate we are setting at $1.029100—the rate from last year. So, it looks like we could set a higher tax rate but are choosing not to do so. If I am understanding this correctly, I think that is a very good thing as it is honoring our commitment as an appointed board to not raise taxes. If my understanding is correct, it would be helpful to have a layman's summary in the supporting documents that states "we are keeping the tax rate level with last year and not raising it." As opposed to asking the public to find that needle in the haystack.	The tax rate that we are asking the board to adopt is already approved by the voters. We are not raising it.
Curriculum and Instruction		
F. Approve 2026-2027 Effective District Framework Accelerator (EDFA) Instructional Leadership Support Grant and Approve the Expenditure of Funds Allowable to Procure Contracted Services EDFA Grant.docx 2	Item F on Consent — On the face of it, this appears to be a great thing, but there is very little detail provided: A) Is this something new that we are doing to support principals and school leaders? Or is this something that the district has done in the past. If we have done it in the past, at what level? Are we doing more this year or less? If less, why? B) While $1M is a lot of money, the impact it can make in a district our size is limited and will require strategic deployment? To that end, where (what schools) will this money be deployed and what process was (or will be) used to determine the schools to which the money is deployed?	A) All state intervention districts are a part of the EDFA inititaive rolled out by TEA. This is a new initaitive for FWISD. B) The dollar amount does not impact a single school. The funding impacts all schools across the district to support the development and implementation of all curriculum materials through ILO. ILO Group works directly with our curriculum department.
	EDFA Instructional Leadership Grant (Consent Item F) Which specific campuses are prioritized in year one, and what's the selection methodology for "campuses that need the most support"?	All schools across the district benefit from the support of the ILO group through the EDFA initiative. In any case where campuses need additional support, this would be referring to our ELEVATE network. One example includes that the ILO group supported the district in the creation of the lesson internalization process which impoacts all elementary schools.
	Consent Item F: Was the ILO Group, LLC, selected from TEA's EDFA State Approved Provider List, and do we have documentation showing that approval? Which ILO services are we approving? What is the scope of work? Does the scope include AiLO, the AiLO Coach, generative-AI tools, AI-generated instructional or leadership materials, or AI professional development? If so, what portion of the contract does that involve? Are we capacity building for district people or outsourcing work/material creation? What is the measurable output or outcome that indicates the services were provided (and worth the expense)? For example, if it's coaching services, how will we know if principals have become better instructional leaders on their campuses? If it's materials, what are they?	TEA selected the ILO group to be its technical assistance partner for the EDFA network that is being utliized in the intervention districts. The funding impacts all schools across the district to support the development and implementation of all curriculum materials through ILO. ILO Group works directly with our curriculum department. At this time, the scope of this work does not include the use of AiLO or its corresponding areas. The support of the ILO group through TEA is focused on developing capacity within our curriculum and instruction department. ILO provdes technical assistance and curriculum development support while our internal staff retains the creation authority and long-term sustainability.

Agenda Items	Question	Response
Operations, Kellie Spencer, Deputy Superintendent		
G. Approve Contract Closeout and Authorize Final Payment for Construction Manager at Risk for Construction Services at Como Success Academy in Conjunction with the 2021 Capital Improvement Program Como Success CMAR loseout docx 2	Item G on Consent — Was the construction project completed in a satisfactory manner? Have all permits been issued? Etc. These are details that would be helpful for the board and the public when we are voting on making payments under construction contracts. The summary provided in the supporting documents provides some contextual history about the contracts that were entered and minimal information about deadlines (it provides the initial target date for completion and the final substantial completion date), but it does not say if that completion date deadline was met and/or if the work was satisfactory/completed in compliance with contract terms.	All criteria are met to close out the project. All scopes of the project are complete and up to standard, and this board item codifies and closes out the project.
H Approve the District Hazardous Routes Designation and Related Transportation Services for Eligible Students Living Within Two Miles of Their Assigned Campus Transportation Hazardous Routes Designations.doq 2 2026-2027 Hazardous Routes Summary.pdf	Item H on Consent — The narrative part of the summary says that approval of the Hazardous Routes plan will make us eligible for additional state funding for transportation. The financial impact section essentially says no net impact. I am assuming that means that whatever money we get in will be spent dollar for dollar on increased transportation and related safety services. Please confirm that is correct?	Confirmed
	Hazardous Routes Designation (Consent Item H) What criteria determine which intersections/campuses make this list — is it complaint-driven, data-driven (crash/crime stats), or both?	Construction areas where it in unsafe to walk, or crossing a railroad track. Observational data and input provided by municipalities, and the school district.
10. ACTION AGENDA ITEMS		
	Action Items Questions I plan to ask at the board meeting during discussion. If I can understand the staffing needs and financial assumptions in advance, that could reduce the need for them. My primary concern is understanding how we moved from the staffing plan presented earlier this year, which passed with significant public pushback, to the $700,000 in contracted services approved in June, to an additional $2.51 million only a few months later. I feel responsible for this spending because I did not voice questions or concerns about the feasibility of the staffing plan before affirming my support. I should have asked questions about the financial and legal risks of not filling those positions.	Regarding the contract extension item for contracted services, these funds are currently in the budget tied to current SLP Vacant Positions. In order to ensure direct services to students are not interrupted, this item utilizes funds attached to current vacant positions to increase contracted services while still recruiting for FWISD employed SLP. As of 9/4, the district has secured 94.7 SLP through a combination of district employed SLP (67) and additional 27.7 positions through contracted services.
Legal, Sid Pounds, General Counsel		
B. Approve Proposed Termination of Certain Probationary Contract Employees for Good Cause Pursuant to Chapter 21 of the Texas Education Code Termination Good Cause Chapter 21 Probationary Contracts.docx C. Approve Proposed Termination of Certain Term Contract Employees for Good Cause Pursuant to Chapter 21 of the Texas Education Code Termination Good Cause Chapter 21 Term Contracts.docx	Action Items B, C, and E — See my comments/questions above under Executive Session Agenda items.	There are two possible employees each for B and C; 4 total employees. This can change pending any resolution prior to the meeting up to 5pm the day of the meeting. Details regarding these cases will be discussed in closed session.

Agenda Items	Question	Response
Learning and Leading Division, Mohammed Choudhury, Deputy Superintendent of Curriculum and Instruction		
D. Approve Additional Contracted Service Providers and Increasing the Amount Previously Approved for Speech Language Pathologists, Diagnosticians, School Psychologists, Occupational Therapists, Music Therapists, Physical Therapists, and Other Evaluation Related Services Additional Contracted Services,docx	Action Item D — This is good news and I appreciate the progress on this front. My questions/comments are: A) See my comment above under "Reports" about discussing the SLP advisory committee. B) We list out services for which these funds can be used to hire contractors and then have a catchall of "other evaluation related services"—what falls in that category? C) The first step is staffing these positions and contractors are the immediate solution but what are we going to do once we have them staffed with contractors to try and fill the positions with full-time employees. D) I think the source of the funding—and the fact that it is a net zero budget move needs to be addressed in the agenda item report. E) Where within the district do we have the most vacancies for SLPs, diagnosticians, and therapists (or all kinds)? Stated another way, do we have specific schools or pyramids that are significantly underserved compared to other schools/pyramids?	A) See response above. B) OT, PT, School Psych, SLP, Diagnosticians C) These contracted services are fluid. As we hire a full time FWISD staff member into a position, we simultaneously end a contractor serving in the capacity. E) We do not have specific schools or pyramids that are significantly underserved. Vacancies do not mean that campuses go without coverage or that required services are left unaddressed. Even if every position were fully filled, OT, PT, speech, and other related service providers would continue to serve multiple campuses. This is the district's service delivery model, with staffing and assignments driven by student IEP requirements, service frequency, caseloads, and overall student need rather than a one-provider-per-campus structure. Evaluation and related services operate through a regional model and support multiple campuses based on evaluation and service needs. Vacancies are managed within these broader staffing structures through adjustments to assignments and available district and contracted capacity, ensuring campuses remain covered, and required student services continue while recruitment is underway.
	Additional Special Education Contracted Providers (Action Item D) Where are the current SLP/psychologist/diagnostician/OT/PT vacancies concentrated by campus or region — is there a pattern relative to campus need level or historically hard-to-staff schools?	OT/PT/School Psychologists operate in a regional model. They support multiple schools. There are zero vacancies out of 8 for PT and 2 vacancies out of 19 for OT. School Psychologists 29 Filled 14 Vacant. Diagnosticians 77 filled and 9 vacant. The contract services item allows for these positions to be filled by contract service providers that are approved without any disruption to student services. SLP Vacancies- 67 Filled with FWISD employees- 33 Vacant- being filled by contract service providers. See prior comment above regarding the current SLP status. No specific region or campus is under-served as it relates to the way FWISD deploys related services across all campuses.

Agenda Items	Question	Response
	Item D What vacancies are generating the savings? (I'm referring to the "funding through payroll savings") When we approved $700,000 in June, what assumptions did that estimate rely on, and what has changed in approximately ten weeks that now requires an additional $2.51 million? Who exactly are these contractors replacing or supplementing? Can you walk us through the SLP staffing plan we approved earlier this year compared with where we are today? Specifically, how many of the approximately 100 full-time SLP positions contemplated in that model are currently filled, how many remain vacant, how many contracted SLPs are currently serving students, and how much of this additional $2.51 million is attributable specifically to speech-language services?" How much of our current contract need is associated with positions or capacity that previously would have been covered by part-time SLPs or SLPAs? Of the $2.51 million being requested, approximately how much represents the cost premium associated with contract staffing rather than direct employment? What is the current recruitment and vacancy-reduction plan for the positions that are generating the need for contracted staff?	The 33 vacancies from SLP and the 14 vacancies from School Psych, the 9 vacancies from Diag, and the 2 vacancies from OT. The goal is to continue to recruit FWISD employees to fill these vacancies so that as we hire, we then replace contract service providers simultaneously. There were more resignations than anticipated with SLP. The assumption was that the district would have a stronger pool of applicants when it comes to SLP and School Psychs. The district did not anticipate the level of resignations that occured. However, we have been able to maintain enough staff through contracted services so that students do not have any interruption in services. School-based speech services are individualized based on each student's identified needs and IEP requirements. Service frequency generally ranges from indirect monitoring provided once a six weeks to direct speech-language services delivered approximately four to six times during a six-week period. During the current six-week reporting period: ● 5,907 students are identified as requiring speech-language services in accordance with their Individualized Education Programs (IEPs). ○Of those students, about 84% have received their scheduled speech services, as of September 4, 2026; as demonstrated by individual student trackers. Any services that are currently remaining during this first six-week period should not automatically be considered as missed or overdue. Students may have services scheduled for later in the reporting period based on the frequency, duration, and delivery model specified in their IEPs. Additionally, some services may have been documented with the service provider and not yet reflected on the tracker.
Talent Management, Denisha Presley, Chief Talent Officer		
E. Approve Reporting of Certain Staff to TEA for Contract Abandonment Reporting of Certain Staff for Contract Abandonment.docx	Action Items B, C, and E — See my comments/questions above under Executive Session Agenda items.	It is important to note that up until 5pm on the day of the board meeting (9/8/26), 14 employees will have the ability to submit documentation. As of now, the number is 14 employees, however, it can reduce should additional documentation be submitted and approved via one of the four qualifyers as described.
Safety and Security		
F. Approve the Purchase of and Delegate Authority to the Superintendent or Designee to Negotiate and Execute an Agreement for CENTENGIX Safety Platform CENTEGIX Safety Platform.docx	Action Item F — I am all for providing additional safety on our campuses, especially when it is a net zero budget item. To that end, I am 100% behind the plan for 1 year (the year for which funding has been secured). However, I cannot cast a vote that would permit entering into a contract with a term of more than a year and uncertainty related to the funding of additional years. In talking to Dr. Kushner, I do not believe that is the plan. I believe the contract being proposed is for one year and we will review and decide upon any extensions of the term at a later date. However, I want to make sure that my understanding is correct. If it is not, I cannot approve the spending of over $2M for any additional years when we do not have it in the budget and when the money could be used to staff each campus with an armed SRO. My sincere hope is that we can do both of those in the future—have the heightened wearable security (hopefully continually funded by community partners) and have SROs on each campus.	Yes, the contract will be reviewed and renewed annually with updated funding sources. Administration is reviewing a proposal that would increase the number of armed guards across the district. Each year, the board will re-review and approve the contract. In the development of the 27-28 budget, a line item will be appropriated to cover the additional year costs while simultaneously seeking additional philanthropic funding support. This item would secure the first two years of the platform use.
	Item F Could you clarify why the cost increases by $804,496 in the second year?	The contract currently aligns with the TIPS contract. The company agreed to amend the year one contract to reflect $1 million dollars utilizing philanthropic funds from Sid Richardson Foundation. The remaining costs are spread throughout the five years of the contract. Each year, the board will re-review and approve the contract. The year one cost includes the start-up funds and year one cost. This item would secure the first two years of the platform use.