

MINUTES OF THE ANCHORAGE SCHOOL BOARD
REGULAR MEETING OF MARCH 24, 2008

The Anchorage School Board met in Regular Session on Monday, March 24, 2008, at 6:30 p.m. in the Board Room, at the Anchorage School District Administration Building. President, Tim Steele, presided.

A. CALL TO ORDER, ROLL CALL, FLAG SALUTE, Tim Steele Presiding

Board Members Present: Tim Steele, John Steiner, Crystal Kennedy, Jeff Friedman, Macon Roberts and Chris Tuck

Board Members Excused: Mary Marks

Others Present: Carol Comeau, Rhonda Gardner, Leslie Vandergaw, Mike Henry, Enid Silverstein, Jerry Sjolander, Jeff Wood, Eric Tollefsen, Michele Egan, Janet Stokesbary, George Vakalis, Jose DelReal, Ray Amsden, Marie Laule, Chad Stiteler, Ron Fuhrer, Johanna Lee, the press, and other interested people.

B. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

The agenda was approved by unanimous consent.

C. ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mr. Steele announced that the elections will be held on April 1 and encouraged everyone to vote. The ballot includes both the school bonds and candidates for school board.

Mr. Steele noted that the school district budget will be going to the Assembly on Tuesday and invited the public to participate in that process by attending the Assembly meeting.

D. AWARDS/RECOGNITIONS/PRESENTATIONS

The Eagle River Recorders, under the direction of Tami Nunley, performed several selections for the entertainment of the Board and other members of public.

ASD Memorandum # 191 - Recognition of United States Senate Youth Program Alaska Representative, Tonei Glavinic

Ms. Crystal Kennedy read that Tonei Glavinic of Steller Secondary School has just returned from a memorable trip to Washington, D.C. Tonei was chosen by state Education Commissioner Barbara Thompson to be a delegate at the 46th annual U.S. Senate Youth Program after reviewing nominations from all over the state. Steller Principal Karin Parker nominated Tonei for this highly competitive, merit-based program.

Tonei joined a group of 104 student delegates to attend the enrichment program, which increases awareness of the American political process and public service. The program's sponsor, the Hearst Foundation, is providing a \$5,000 scholarship to Tonei.

Tonei is an active volunteer. He is a member of the ASD Student Advisory Board, president of the United Youth Courts of Alaska board of directors and a presiding judge for Anchorage Youth Court. He is also a member of the Gay, Lesbian & Straight Education Network National Student Leadership Team and National Advisory Council. He has been recognized by the Spirit of Youth Foundation and has earned several awards for more than 1,000 hours of service.

The Board recognized Tonei for his outstanding achievements and dedication to public service. They voiced their gratitude that our state and district were represented by such an accomplished young man.

ASD Memorandum # 191 - Recognition of the AARP Ethel Percy Andrus Award Recipient, East High School

Mr. Chris Tuck read that the Alaska office of the American Association of Retired Persons has bestowed its \$10,000 Ethel Percy Andrus Award for Innovation, on East High School. Named for the founder of AARP, Dr. Andrus was an innovator herself, becoming the first woman to lead a public high school.

Alaska AARP Director Dr. Kenneth Osterkamp told Principal Michael Graham that his school's application "stood head and shoulders above the rest." The judges noted three innovative student-led programs at East: Change of Heart, Be the Change and Partner's Club and its Advisory Program.

Judges comments included such praise as “Excellent programs for all students;” and “At a time with so much emphasis on a testing culture, East has implemented several programs that create a caring schoolwide culture, increased student connectedness and student-staff partnerships.”

East’s innovative programs will be featured in the next issue of the state chapter’s newsletter, which is distributed to 93,000 members in Alaska.

The Board recognized AARP for its generous and substantial support of public education in Alaska, and congratulated our award-winning East High School principal and personnel for their efforts to increase student success.

E. SPECIAL ADVISORY REPORTS

1. Student Advisory Board

Mr. Jose DelReal reported that the SAB passed a resolution on disability awareness. The resolution was read into the record.

Be it resolved by the Anchorage School District Student Advisory Board:

Whereas 49 million Americans (approximately 17%) have a disability; and

Whereas 4.5% of Americans 18 or under have a severe disability; and

Whereas there are 900,000 deaf and 1 million blind Americans; and
Whereas deaf and blind communities have a unique culture that is unknown to many Americans and education about these cultures would increase effective communication and interactions; and

Whereas a majority of disabled Americans play an active role in society and therefore must interact with other citizens on a regular basis; and

Whereas there are serious communication issues with individuals who are developmentally disabled, blind and deaf; and

Whereas there has been a history of harassment and degradation of individuals with special needs; and

Whereas Special Education services are available to students in the Anchorage School District from ages 3 - 21; and

Whereas, the Anchorage School District motto is “Educating all students for success in life,” and its student will be much more

successful in life if they are able to effectively communicate, interact with and help all individuals; and

Whereas high school students are required to take 7.5 elective credits; and

Whereas no curriculum exists in the Anchorage School District that covers all varieties of disabilities; and

Whereas learning about disabilities and how to effectively communicate, interact with, and assist people with disabilities would increase compassion and understanding within schools and the community;

Therefore be it resolved by the Anchorage School District Advisory Board that the SAB support the introduction of a 0.5 credit social studies elective focusing on the wide range of mental and physical disabilities present in Anchorage and the United States.

Be it further resolved that the Student Advisory Board also recommend implementation of a disability awareness curriculum in middle school.

Mr. DelReal briefly explained the background of this resolution. Ms. Kennedy asked whether anyone on the SAB was familiar with any kind of similar curriculum or resources available to develop such a curriculum. Mr. DelReal indicated that he was not aware of any current curriculum in this area.

Ms. Comeau noted that this resolution would be forwarded to the Curriculum Department for review and discussion.

2. Military Delegate

Lt. Col. Luu was unable to attend the meeting. In his absence, Mr. Brian Griggs indicated that there was nothing to report at this time.

3. M.E.C.A.C.

Mr. Dan Loring voiced his appreciation to the board for the recent joint meeting with the MECAC. He indicated that many sensitive issues were discussed with progress being made toward clarity and understanding between members of the two groups. It was his hope that the dialogue could continue through regularly scheduled joint meetings in the future.

Mr. Friedman noted that the recent meeting was just the beginning and it is also his hope that there will be more opportunities for joint meetings in the future.

Mr. Steiner noted that one of the topics discussed at the joint meeting was the idea of incorporating a student voice into the MECAC. He hoped that the MECAC will follow up on that suggestion.

F. PERSONS TO BE HEARD NON-AGENDA ITEMS

Ms. Tammy Hogge, PTSA president at Goldenview Middle School, spoke regarding the use of cell phones in public schools. Her concern is how the school district will follow through and police the policy on cell phone use in the schools. She wondered how much instruction time is being disrupted by cell phone usage and the monitoring of cell phone usage. Ms. Hogge reported that she has discussed the issue with a number of teachers and noted that there is no consistency in how different staff members enforce the policy. Ms. Hogge asked the board to review the policy to determine how it should be enforced consistently across the district.

Ms. Comeau noted that the intent of the policy is to not have cell phones on at all between the start of the school day and the end of the day with the exception of lunch period. She understands that monitoring cell phones and consistently enforcing the policy could be a challenge and certainly something that can be looked at again.

Mr. Steve Piper, math teacher at Goldenview Middle School, indicated his belief that student success at Goldenview is being jeopardized by improper staffing. He noted that students are subjected to classes of 40 or more students in pre-algebra and algebra sections at the start of the school year. Valuable academic time on task is lost by the time the schedules are worked out and adequate staff is in place. It is not just academics. The social and emotional impact of having to shuffle schedules is very traumatic to students at the middle school level. He noted that the school principal, counselors and department heads have tried to avoid and schedule around this problem for years but the simple fact is that there is no in-house solution. He suggests that the formula used to staff the schools be changed. He indicated that the solution would involve scheduling students in the spring and then having a consult with the individual schools to determine what is needed to make the programs

work come fall. He encouraged the board to take some positive action to address this problem.

During discussion Mr. Piper clarified that it would be good to have the staffing done at a fundamental level and then determine what other teacher support is needed in order to make the special programs, such as advanced math and science classes, actually fit so that classes would have the correct numbers at the very start of the school year. He noted that class size has been worked out in the past but that the process takes several weeks at the beginning of the year during which time substitute teachers are being used and student schedules are being changed. The primary concern is that the problem be fixed prior to classes starting.

Ms. Comeau noted that there are several challenges to registering students in the spring including the number of students who move over the summer and the number of zone exemptions allowed at particular schools. Schedules that are built in the spring only work until a rash of new students show up during activation in the fall. Ms. Comeau noted that the most challenging scheduling to do is at the middle school levels. She is hopeful that the district budget will be known earlier this year which will allow staffing issues to be addressed much earlier as well.

Ms. Gloria Hanrahan, PTSA president at Wendler Middle School, and Ms. Teresa Columbus, Wendler PTSA executive board member, spoke regarding equal access to food during the school day for all ASD students. They thanked the board for responding in a quick and efficient manner in addressing the needs at the middle school level. They continue to be concerned for students at the high school level who may not have equal access to food during the school day. The speakers requested that ASD have a consistent charge policy for all students so that no child is unable to access food during the school day.

Mr. Vakalis noted that the procedures have been changed since the last time this issue was brought up. He clarified that all students, including high school students, can now charge if they do not have the money. The cautionary note is that Student Nutrition Fund is a self-supporting fund and therefore can not absorb debt. Mr. Hanrahan noted that fundraising efforts have been made at Wendler to help address this and suggested that other schools could make similar efforts. Ms. Comeau noted the importance of working with the students to make sure that charges are paid and to make sure that qualifying student file the Free and Reduced Lunch forms.

Ms. Audrey Kern, a member of the Goldenview PTSA executive committee, noted the importance of providing a stable educational environment for students. She indicated her belief that the school system itself disrupts that stability when appropriate staffing is not in place at the beginning of the school year. School staffing should not only take into consideration the number of students per class but should also allow for special needs and gifted classes to be staffed. Ms. Kern explained that she has spoken to legislators who indicate a willingness to provide additional funding to address the issue. She requested that adjustments be made to stop the reassignment of staff after the first two weeks of school.

Mr. Steiner noted that it would be great if the staffing could be based on numbers that are rounded up. While it would certainly not be bad for individual schools, the districtwide budget can not support additional staff at every school. He agreed that shifting the timing of staffing would be beneficial. Mr. Friedman indicated that knowing what the district funding will be earlier this year will allow staffing issues to be addressed earlier in the process.

H. CONSENT AGENDA

Consent Agenda is attached. **All attachments referred to in memoranda Recommendations are on file in the Superintendent's office.**

1. Approval of Minutes
 - a. Regular Meeting - December 17, 2007
2. ASD Memorandum # 209 - Resolution in Support of the Week of the Young Child

The Administration recommends the Anchorage School Board approve and adopt the attached resolution in support of the Week of the Young Child, April 13-19, 2008.

3. ASD Memorandum # 221 - School Board Policy Revisions: Sections 841, Political Activities in the School; 841.1, Political Candidacy and Public Offices; 842, Gifts (Second Reading)

It is the Policy Subcommittee's recommendation that the Anchorage School Board adopt on Second Reading the proposed revisions to sections 841, Political Activities in the School; 841.1, Political Candidacy and Public Officers; and 842, Gifts.

4. ASD Memorandum # 205 - Award of Contract: Miscellaneous School Supplies

It is the Administration's recommendation that the School Board approve and authorize the Superintendent to award a contract to Pyramid School Products to furnish Miscellaneous School Supplies in the amount of \$143,169.

5. ASD Memorandum # 217 - Award of Contract: Heating System Repairs, Inlet View Elementary School

It is the Administration's recommendation the School Board approve and authorize the Superintendent to award a contract for the Inlet View Elementary School Heating System Repairs Project, to the lowest responsive bidder, Consolidated Contracting and Engineering for the Base Bid amount of \$263,222, and Assignment A for \$38,881 for a total award price of \$302,103.

6. ASD Memorandum # 223 - Award of Contract: Huffman Elementary School Domestic Water System Upgrade

It is the Administration's recommendation the School Board approve and authorize the Superintendent to award a contract for the Huffman Elementary School Domestic Water System Upgrades Project, to the lowest bidder, Consolidated Contracting and Engineering for the Base Bid amount of \$233,222, and Assignment A for \$4,702, for a total award price of \$237,924.

7. ASD Memorandum # 224 - Award of Contract: Romig Middle School Heating System Revisions

It is the Administration's recommendation the School Board approve and authorize the Superintendent to award a contract for the Romig Middle School Heating System Revisions to the lowest bidder, Lewis Mechanical, Inc. for the Base Bid amount of \$236,659 and Assignment 1 for \$37,288 for a total award price of \$273,947.

8. ASD Memorandum # 225 - Award of Contract: Gruening Middle School Domestic Water System Upgrades

It is the Administration's recommendation the School Board approve and authorize the Superintendent to award a contract for the Gruening Middle School Domestic Water System Upgrades Project, to the lowest bidder, Consolidated Contracting and Engineering for the Base Bid amount of \$303,333, and Alternate 1 for \$21,222 for a total award price of \$324,555.

9. ASD Memorandum # 222 - Award of Contract: Chugiak Elementary School Traffic Safety Upgrades

It is the Administration's recommendation that the School Board approve and authorize the Superintendent to award a contract for the Chugiak Elementary School Traffic Safety Upgrade to Roger Hickel Contracting, Inc. for the Base Bid award amount of \$860,900 and Alternate #1, \$240,500 for total award of \$1,101,400.

10. ASD Memorandum # 229 - Award of Contract: Anchorage School District Warehouse Heating System Upgrades

It is the Administration's recommendation the School Board approve and authorize the Superintendent to award a contract for the ASD Warehouse Heating System Upgrades Project to Goertz Construction, Inc. for the Base Bid award of \$672,130 and Base Bid Assignment for \$56,719, Alternate 1 for \$61,028 and Assignment 1 for \$16,418, and Alternate 2 for \$77,760 and Assignment 2 for \$18,744 for a total amount of \$902,799.

11. ASD Memorandum # 230 - Award of Contract: Campbell Elementary School Re-Roof and Structural Upgrades

It is the Administration's recommendation that the School Board approve and authorize the Superintendent to award a contract for the Campbell Elementary School Re-roof & Structural Upgrades Project to Goertz Construction, Inc. for the Base Bid award amount of \$469,134 and the Alternate No. 1 for \$75,422 for a total award amount of \$544,556.

12. ASD Memorandum # 231 - Award of Contract: Trust Authority Building Renovations Project

It is the Administration's recommendation that the School Board approve the selection of JKM General Contractors, LLC, as the Design/Builder for the Trust Authority Building Renovations Project and authorize the Superintendent to award a contract for the amount of \$329,613.

13. ASD Memorandum # 233 - Award of Contract: Multi-School CCTV Installation & Security System Upgrades

It is the Administration's recommendation that the School Board approve the selection of ATS Alaska, Inc., as the Design/Builder for the Multi-School CCTV Installation & Security System Upgrade, and authorize the Superintendent to award a contract for the amount of \$3,482,600.

14. ASD Memorandum # 234 - Profession Services Selection for CCTV & Security Systems Upgrades Construction Administration

It is the Administration's recommendation that the School Board approve the selection of RSA Engineering, Inc., for Construction Administration Services on the Multi-School CCTV Installation & Security System Upgrade Project, and authorize the Superintendent to negotiate and enter into a contract with RSA Engineering, Inc., for Construction Administration Services.

15. ASD Memorandum # 207 - Personnel Report

It is the Administration's recommendation that the School Board approve the attached Personnel Report.

Mr. Steele asked that Memorandum #233, Award of Contract: Multi-School CCTV Installation & Security System Upgrades, be pulled for discussion.

Mr. Friedman asked that Memorandum #234, Professional Services Selection for CCTV & Security Systems Upgrades Construction Administration, be pulled for discussion.

ACTION:

Moved by: Macon Roberts
Seconded by: Jeff Friedman

To approve the Minutes of the Regular Meeting of December 17, 2008, and Memoranda #209, #221, #205, #217, #223, #224, #225, #222, #229, #230, #231, and #207.

VOTE:

Ayes: Steiner, Friedman,
Kennedy, Tuck,
Steele, Roberts

Nays: None

Excused: Marks

MOTION PASSED

ASD Memorandum # 233 - Award of Contract: Multi-School CCTV Installation & Security System Upgrades

It is the Administration's recommendation that the School Board approve the selection of ATS Alaska, Inc., as the Design/Builder for the Multi-

School CCTV Installation & Security System Upgrade, and authorize the Superintendent to award a contract for the amount of #3,482,600.

ACTION:

Moved by: Jeff Friedman
Seconded by: Macon Roberts

To approve the selection of ATS Alaska, Inc., as the Design/Builder for the Multi-School CCTV Installation & Security System Upgrade, and authorize the Superintendent to award a contract for the amount of #3,482,600.

Ms. Carol Comeau introduced Mr. Mark Mew who provided a brief overview on the process used to develop this recommendation.

Mr. Mew explained that the district has been experimenting with CCTV since 2004 and made a decision in 2006 to start procuring systems that would be kept long term. The process included evaluating the technology, how CCTV related to security systems and the eventual move toward access control. It was decided in 2006 to standardize the district's CCTV systems on a product called a DVMRE Pro with GE using a variety of analog cameras and to plan for an eventual migration to IP cameras when it was felt that the technology was stable and the district was ready to migrate. One of the driving factors in the decision was the ability to easily integrate the CCTV cameras with the access control system as well as the upgraded alarm system being installed in the schools. The district has seventeen schools and two support facilities up and running on the GE product. We are now at a point, with a variety of different funding sources, when we are looking at adding approximately twenty schools with CCTV and approximately to thirty schools with Infographics, which is the burglar alarm system and the baseline for card reader access control.

Mr. Mew explained that the district has reviewed what has transpired over the last couple of years in this technology including reconsideration of IP technology. He indicated that the district will probably, at some point, incorporate IP cameras but to do so now would mean either living with disparate systems that wouldn't integrate for the foreseeable future or giving up on ever integrating the systems into one seamless security package. Mr. Mew indicated that there is a migration path to IP. It has been recognized for some time that the industry is moving in that direction. For that reason the district is wiring with Cat-5E cable, delivering power to the cameras over Ethernet so extra wire will not be required when IP becomes available. The product that is being

recommended is the next generation of GE DVR technology which is a hybrid system. Each DVR contains the ability to hook-up four IP cameras as well as twelve analog cameras in whatever combination chosen. The systems are new and have more features than what the district has today. GE is upgrading the software that allows the cameras to be reviewed remotely. The software will also be backward compatible so that the existing DVRs can also be viewed. The integration software is also being updated so that access control, alarms and cameras can be tied together and will work with the existing DVRs as well as the ones the district is about to purchase. This will allow the district to start moving in the direction of integration without having to throw away the systems that have already been purchased or starting over at the sites that have Infographics today. Mr. Mew indicated that one day the district will likely have a pure IP system but the plan is to ramp up as technology changes and as GE moves to a total IP solution. The district will get system upgrades incrementally as the technology comes along so that as old DVRs wear out they will be replaced with new technology. The advantages of moving to an IP solution today were not thought to be significant enough to justify throwing away the other systems that have been brought on over the last few years.

Mr. Bob Thibault introduced himself and indicated that he was present to field questions as necessary.

Mr. Macon Roberts asked whether the new cameras function on motion sensors. Thibault indicated that motion sensor technology is built into the software.

Mr. Friedman asked for clarification on the security alarm systems and the integration between the cameras and the existing security alarms. Mr. Mew indicated that the district has been discussing the eventuality of having our systems integrated so that all three systems can be seen at once, however that capability is not in place at this time. He noted that getting disparate systems made by different manufacturers to integrate seamlessly with all of the mapping features needed would be almost impossible to do. Mr. Friedman restated for clarification that the district already has GE alarms systems in a number of schools and that if the district were to buy something other than what is in the recommendation it would be difficult to integrate those two systems. Mr. Mew agreed with that statement.

Mr. Tuck voiced a concern that there is no proof that GE could integrate the three systems. He wondered whether any attempt has been made to

integrate systems currently in place. Mr. Mew noted that the district has access control and alarm systems at the Education Building running on Diamond2 software. However, there has not yet been an attempt to integrate the camera system nor has the mapping piece been purchased.

Mr. Tuck wondered whether we have checked to find examples of successful integration at other districts. Mr. Roger Weese, RSA Engineering, indicated that he can not provide specific examples with respect to the GE security system. The question has not been pursued recently because GE is working on the next generation of software that should make the integration even better. Mr. Weese noted that they have seen an example of that software as part of a sales demonstration. The intent with this project is to utilize that software when it becomes available in the third quarter of this year.

Mr. Steele asked whether the district has a commitment from GE that the software will work. Mr. Weese noted that we have a commitment in writing. Mr. Steiner wondered whether the commitment is part of a contractual agreement. Mr. Weese explained that the district is not purchasing that software component yet. The district is purchasing an expansion of the existing system and that expansion includes the additional feature set which is this software upgrade that will make the integration easier. Mr. Mew explained that Mr. Weese was referring to a program called Facility Commander that is designed specifically for facilities to operate all three of their security systems on one front end platform. We have been told that the system the district currently has could integrate video but that has not yet been tried. The upgrade to Facility Commander is provided at no additional cost pursuant to the software service agreement that the district has in place with GE.

Mr. Tuck indicated that many of the contractors are concerned about the liability of integrating the systems. When this issue was discussed by the board at a previous meeting it had been reported that the district was going into a maintenance agreement with GE in which GE would guarantee that those items will be backwards compatible. Mr. Mew clarified that GE's guarantee to the district is that if the district maintains a software service agreement we will get all the necessary upgrades to keep all three components of our system talking to each and that the software would work with older components and with new technology as it comes along. That same software is the piece that does the integration between the three systems.

Mr. Tuck asked whether an addendum came out with that contract so that the contractors that were bidding the job understood that the integration was GE's responsibility, not the contractors. Mr. Weese clarified that in this project the district does not have a contract with GE. The district will have a contract with the successful bidder. That bidder, through the contract documents, must perform certain tasks. One of those tasks is the video integration component when it becomes available in approximately the third quarter on this year.

Mr. Tuck noted that he had reviewed the consultant's report written by Mr. Weese approximately two years ago regarding this issue. He noted that he had contacted Clark County School District, which was the example that was referenced in the report as a successful install, and learned that they have no integration between their security and their card access. Mr. Tuck noted that the consultant's report emphasized durability, simplicity, quality and cost. In his view an IP solution wins on all of those points. Mr. Weese indicated that the cost of IP video is still more expensive and he believed that any of the contracting community that would bid an IP project would bid it higher than with analog video. He also noted that, as far durability and simplicity goes, it is hard to beat the embedded analog DVR system that is in place. They have performed very well and have required little or no maintenance. If the decision were to be made today with no installed base a different conclusion may be reached. However, with the installed base the district already has and with GE's performance thus far combined with the lower cost and limited funding source, Mr. Weese would still recommend the embedded solution. The installed base is really the key here.

Mr. Friedman understood that one of the other differences between this district and Clark County School District is that Clark County built with co-axle cable while our plans are for the district to use Cat-5 cable. Mr. Mew indicated that current cameras can be switched to IP cameras as necessary at some point in the future using the same cable. He noted much of the expense of installing a new system is drilling the holes and running the wires. We have already put that in place in preparation for a future migration to IP.

Ms. Kennedy referred to the section of the consultant's report addressing the maintenance costs of the system. Mr. Mew noted that the Maintenance Department has gotten a contract with Deibold to maintain the existing DVR system in order to measure the level of maintenance required over a period of time to identify how often the cameras break and determine what the cost of maintenance will be as the number of

schools on the system expands. When the district moves to IP the maintenance will be more of an IT issue. Mr. Weese noted that the consultant's report was referring to the fact that the maintenance of whatever system is chosen needs to be addressed as a budgetary item which could be a major obstacle for the district. The district will have to take ownership and allocate staff and maintenance funding regardless of which system is selected. Mr. Vakalis reiterated that the district has a maintenance contract in place at this time in order to both maintain the current system and provide experiential data on maintenance requirements. This action was taken in an effort to address the concerns raised in the consultant's report regarding system maintenance.

Mr. Steiner asked about the age of the system currently in place in the district. Mr. Mew noted that all of the systems are less than two years old. The manufacturer has a three year warranty on the system and indicates a general replacement time of approximately six to seven years. Real world experience, such as that at Clark County School District, has shown that the systems are lasting substantially longer than that.

Mr. Steiner asked whether it was appropriate for the system in place at approximately 20% of district facilities to drive the decision as to what system should be put into place in an additional 30% of district facilities. Mr. Mew noted that a great deal of research was done just prior to going out with this procurement. A group of people from several departments across the district met in November to go through the consultant's report and reviewed current technology. Not one person in the group felt that it made good sense to change now. The current system is serving the needs of the district and is paid for. The alternatives were not enough better to justify throwing that system away. It is a good, stable system and does what the district needs it to do.

Mr. Tuck asked why this did not go out in a RFP process or a design build process to put out the parameters of what we need and expect and then see what other options the software companies could come up. He wondered how the district ended up going the sole proprietary route. Mr. Mew noted that there was a time when casting a wider net was considered but after the review and discussion in October and November it was determined that there was no reason to buy a product other than a GE based product. The district had standardized on the platform but the procurement is still competitive from that point.

Mr. Steiner asked whether there was an opportunity for anybody who thought that the specifications were improper to protest when the RFP

went out. Mr. Vakalis indicated that there was such an opportunity and that no one raised a formal protest.

Mr. Tuck indicated that he had several concerns with this contract. The first is that the district is going sole proprietary on something that has not been proven. Mr. Tuck reviewed the technical aspects of the systems and noted his concern with the architecture of what is being put in the school. In addition, he voiced concern with the need for two cables for each camera, one to power the camera and one to bring the signal back. With power over Ethernet on an IP system only one cable is necessary. He noted his belief that the board may want to think about just letting the system currently in place go and going to open architecture in order to improve and expand with new systems going forward. It is his suggestion that the board delay approval on this contract and let the RFP process take place.

Mr. Friedman indicated that he had shared some of the concerns raised by Mr. Tuck however testimony this evening had certainly argued against his position. He noted, for example, that the current system is already using power over the Ethernet for the cameras. Another issue to consider is that the district has seventeen GE camera systems in different schools and seventeen GE security systems in place, not necessarily in the same schools. The district would ultimately be throwing away some of those security systems as well as the camera systems. Mr. Friedman noted that if the district were starting fresh he would agree with Mr. Tuck, but we are not starting fresh. The reality of having working equipment in place can not be ignored.

Mr. Steiner indicated that he found the testimony and explanations pretty convincing that a thorough evaluation has been done. He contemplated the ramifications of postponing action on this recommendation in order to determine whether it would be beneficial to let an RFP that does not specify a proprietary system. He wondered about postponing action on this recommendation in order to get input from the administration on the possibility of going back out for a more generic RFP to determine if there are other options that would work for the district.

Ms. Kennedy noted that this is a very technical and complicated issue. She voiced her concern that there was a rush to take action before all of the questions and concerns were identified and addressed.

ACTION:

Moved by: John Steiner
Seconded by: Jeff Friedman

To postpone this decision to the next board meeting with a request for a report from the administration as to the benefits and hazards of issuing a more open RFP that would allow for alternatives other than the GE system.

Mr. Steiner asked whether the administration has a response as to why the board should not postpone action at this time.

Mr. Steele noted that postponing action on this item would impact action on the next item on the agenda.

The meeting went into a brief recess at 8:35 p.m. and was called back into session at 8:50 p.m.

Mr. Vakalis clarified several issues regarding the original recommendation. He noted that this process has been going on for quite some time and there has not been a rush to bring it to a conclusion. The district has been working on this for over two years. Tests have taken place at various schools to evaluate different systems. He reminded the board that there had been vendors who donated equipment to be able to use as tests in order to determine the best way to proceed to get security taken care of in the schools. The paramount issue is to have a reliable security system in the schools that can be used should the district have to go to court. He noted that we have such a system today and it has proven to be very productive for the district. The system currently in place was not established overnight nor was it inexpensive. The district has invested over \$3 million in the cameras and the Infographic systems. This recommendation was well researched. Collectively, as a staff, the overwhelming decision was to proceed with this recommendation. It is extremely important to get a system on board to address the issue of vandalism.

Mr. Vakalis noted that the specific motion on the floor at this time is to come back to the board at the next meeting and make a recommendation with pros and cons of going out to have the industry come back to the district with a recommendation as the best way to proceed and to make sure that the document is all inclusive so that they understand what the district goals and objectives are, they understand the operating systems that we are currently working with, they understand the nature and the scope of our schools and the understand our financial restrictions. He

indicated that the administration can come back with the pros and cons of that action but it will take longer than the time available prior to the next meeting. In addition, to draft an RFP and have it scoped in the manner that has been suggested will probably take an additional four months. It would then be at least an additional month to allow for responses. The time frame is now at approximately six months which would then be followed by the evaluation and award process. In total this action would require at least seven to eight months. That would mean that the district would be on hold for seven to eight months while the cost of goods continues to increase.

Mr. Vakalis asked the board to allow the administration to continue with the process that has been set out, trust the many hours that the staff has put in to making sure this product is best for the district and allow it to be delivered on time in order to protect the district's assets.

Mr. Tuck indicated that the specifications on the contract that was already put out were pretty detailed. All that was being suggested was to open it up to other manufacturers rather than limiting it to GE as sole proprietor. He did not believe that the administration would need to start from scratch to draft an RFP. He noted that part of the process is for the board to educate themselves about the contract prior to approval. Mr. Vakalis agreed and added that part of the process is for the administration to answer the board's questions as accurately and thoroughly as possible. He noted that this issue had been discussed in a great deal of detail at a previous meeting. In addition, staff members and administrators have also had meetings with individual board members to further answer questions. He reiterated that the best recommendation of the administration is to not delay the project.

Ms. Comeau noted that there has been a concerted effort to answer questions that have been posed by board members over the last two months regarding this issue. There is some frustration that the same questions are being asked repeatedly and the staff continues to look into the questions with the same responses. She noted that this has been a huge interest for over two years and she trusts that her staff has done their due diligence in making this recommendation. She acknowledged that Mr. Tuck has a different perspective and appreciated the important questions that he has raised. She reiterated that this recommendation has not been made quickly. This has been a very long, thoughtful process by staff and Ms. Comeau is confident that they are bringing the very best recommendation to the board based on the needs of the district.

Mr. Tuck indicated that he appreciated the due diligence and the attention to detail that has been taken on this recommendation. He also voiced his appreciation for the time that has been taken to educate him on how the decision was reached. His understanding is that the decision comes down to two things. The first is that the district already has an investment and wants to capitalize on that investment. The second is the promise that we will be able to integrate the systems that we have as well as making future systems backward compatible. He continued to be concerned about the propriety nature of the contract and with being tied to an analog architecture.

Ms. Kennedy noted that it was stated that there is a migration path to IP in place and wondered why the recommendation would not be to move in that direction from this point forward rather than delaying that effort by continuing to put analog systems in place. She voiced her inclination to postpone action on this recommendation in order to gather more information.

Mr. Friedman indicated that he did not believe that postponing action on this recommendation would garner any new information.

Mr. Steiner explained that part of the reason he brought the motion to postpone forward was his preference against proprietary specifications. He noted that such specification inherently puts severe limitations on competition. He acknowledged, however, that delaying the project by putting out a new RFP would cause a significant delay which would result a loss of security over a long period including a risk to some of our facilities. In addition a delay could increase the final cost for the same result. The questions are how much security will be in place, how fast and at what cost.

Mr. Steele believed that this recommendation had been thoroughly discussed and that all of the options have been reviewed.

Mr. Tuck noted that the technology is at a critical point. The beauty of waiting until the next meeting is that it provides an opportunity for board members to do their own research.

VOTE on MOTION to POSTPONE:

Ayes: Kennedy, Tuck,
Steiner

Nays: Roberts, Steele,
Friedman

Excused: Marks

MOTION FAILED

Mr. Tuck noted that, while it is difficult to give up the systems that are already in place, he believes that those systems will be antiquated very soon. He indicated that, given all of his previously outlined concerns, he would not be able to support the recommendation.

Mr. Friedman noted that even if the industry moves away from DVRs in the very near future it does not mean that this system will not serve our needs for the foreseeable future. This equipment works and it does what we need it to do. In addition, it allows the district to take advantage of future technology changes.

Ms. Kennedy indicated that she still has doubts as to whether the system really does what the district wants it to do because there is still a question regarding the integration software. Mr. Friedman responded that there is a greater likelihood that GE equipment will integrate with other GE equipment than expecting some other manufacturer's equipment to integrate with GE. He noted that there is already integration software available for the GE system that the district has chosen not to gear up in light of the anticipated upgrade. He believed that it would be more risky to go with another company rather than with GE who has every incentive to make their equipment work.

Mr. Tuck reiterated his belief that the district will be the beta test site for the integration product. Usually the beta test site experiences a huge discount as the manufacturer wants to use it as a demonstration to others. He believed that it is a poor use of tax dollars to enter into a contract with no guarantee of successful product integration.

Mr. Steiner clarified that this contract is for purchase of the video surveillance system and the recording system. He understood that the integration is a separate thing that is expected in the future but that the district is not specifically purchasing that integration software. Rather, we are purchasing a product that will be integratable in the future. In the meantime, we will have a product in place that performs the function for which it is needed; to provide security for our facilities. He believed that the district is better off to capitalize on the work that has been done getting this contract in place and then look to open it up to the competitive marketplace on the next contract.

In response to a request for clarification, Mr. Weese explained that the integration piece is specified in the contract. When the Facility Commander software comes out the contractor is required to use it for the video integration component. That component is in the specifications.

The software is provided under the software maintenance agreement. This video integration is just one of many features available in the software. The district is paying for the integration of the video system with the security system, whether it is done with Facility Commander or another software program.

VOTE on ORIGINAL MOTION:

Ayes: Steiner, Friedman,
Kennedy, Steele,
Roberts

Nays: Tuck

Excused: Marks

MOTION PASSED

ASD Memorandum # 234 - Profession Services Selection for CCTV & Security Systems Upgrades Construction Administration

It is the Administration's recommendation that the School Board approve the selection of RSA Engineering, Inc., for Construction Administration Services on the Multi-School CCTV Installation & Security System Upgrade Project, and authorize the Superintendent to negotiate and enter into a contract with RSA Engineering, Inc., for Construction Administration Services.

ACTION:

Moved by: Jeff Friedman
Seconded by: Macon Roberts

To approve the selection of RSA Engineering, Inc., for Construction Administration Services on the Multi-School CCTV Installation & Security System Upgrade Project, and authorize the Superintendent to negotiate and enter into a contract with RSA Engineering, Inc., for Construction Administration Services.

Mr. Friedman indicated that he had pulled this recommendation in light of the possibility that the previous recommendation would fail. He was concerned that passing this on Consent Agenda could have caused problems should that have occurred.

VOTE:

Ayes: Steiner, Friedman,
Kennedy, Tuck,
Steele, Roberts

Nays: None

Excused: Marks

MOTION PASSED

I. SUPERINTENDENT'S REPORT

1. ASD Memorandum #208 - Project Status Report

This is a report of activities and project status changes in Major Capital Projects during the period of January 31, 2008 through February 13, 2008.

2. ASD Memorandum # 211 - Facility Contract Modification Report and Completed Projects for the Month of February 2008

The monthly Facility Contract Modification Report for the month of February 2008 is attached. There are no contract modifications or exceptions to report this month.

3. ASD Memorandum #212 - Operating Budget Transfers February Monthly Report FY 2007-2008

The attached report of budget transfers for the time period of February 2008 that were processed in the Integrated Financial Accounting System (IFAS) includes the following:

Attachment A: Report of Budget Transfers Over \$5,000 - Report for individual transfers of more than \$5,000, which includes summarized justifications.

The schedule of monthly budget transfers processed for the month of February 2008 and related information are available in the Budget Department office for review by the School Board and members of the public.

4. ASD Memorandum #213 - Treasurer's Report/Financial Recap: February 29, 2008

The attached report consists of two parts: the Treasurer's Report and the Financial Recap. The Treasurer's Report and the Financial Recap

are presented on a monthly basis. The Treasurer's report and Financial Recap are year-to-date information as of February 29, 2008.

J. PERSONS TO BE HEARD ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS

Mr. Dan Loring urged the public to vote in support of the school bonds at the coming election.

Mr. Loring thanked the district for created the Social and Emotional Learning program. He noted that his family is currently engaged in this process and praised the team at Bartlett High School.

Mr. Loring asked the board to consider funding and growing the PRIDE program. He suggested that the program would be appropriate at West, Bartlett, and East high schools.

Mr. Loring indicated that it had come to attention that words that he may have spoken have been offensive to some people. In light of that he offered his apology to the board and the superintendent for any words that he has spoken or words he may speak in the future that have or will offend. He also offered an apology to ASD staff and committee members for words that are personally offensive. Finally, he offered an apology to any family, parent, student or community members that may have found or may find any of his words to be offensive. He stated that it was not and never will be his intent to offend people. Although there are conversations that are hard to have and statistics that are hard to discuss he believed that we must have those conversations. World class personal, academic, vocational achievement should be goal and he believed that, given the collective will, high expectations and great relationships, all students can achieve these goals and be extremely competitive in a global economy in the 21st century.

K. COMMUNICATIONS & SCHOOL BOARD COMMENTS

Ms. Kennedy noted that the Policy Subcommittee will be meeting at 3:30 p.m. on Wednesday, April 2.

L. EXECUTIVE SESSION - PERSONNEL/FINANCE/NEGOTIATIONS
LITIGATION

M. ADJOURNMENT

The Regular Meeting of March 24, 2008, was adjourned by unanimous consent at 9:45 p.m.

Tim Steele, President

Crystal Kennedy, Clerk

Johanna Lee, Recording Secretary

Date Minutes Approved