

BOARD OF EDUCATION

Portland Public Schools
STUDY SESSION
February 3, 2014

Board Auditorium

Blanchard Education Service Center
501 N. Dixon Street
Portland, Oregon 97227

Note: Those wishing to speak before the School Board should sign the public comment sheet prior to the start of the meeting. No additional speakers will be accepted after the sign-in sheet is removed, but testifiers are welcome to sign up for the next meeting. While the School Board wants to hear from the public, comments must be limited to three minutes. All those testifying must abide by the Board's Rules of Conduct for Board meetings.

Public comment related to an action item on the agenda will be heard immediately following staff presentation on that issue. Public comment on all other matters will be heard during the "Public Comment" time.

This meeting may be taped and televised by the media.

AGENDA

1. **PUBLIC COMMENT** 6:00 pm
2. **ED SPECS** (action item) 6:20 pm
3. **DISCUSSION: OPEN ENROLLMENT** 7:00 pm
4. **PRESENTATION: FOOD ALLERGIES** 7:30 pm
5. **FIRST READING: REVISED PUBLIC CONTRACTING RULES** 8:00 pm
6. **PRESENTATION: MULTNOMAH EDUCATION SERVICE DISTRICT LOCAL SERVICE PLAN** 8:20 pm
7. **BUSINESS AGENDA** 8:35 pm
8. **ADJOURN** 8:50 pm

Portland Public Schools Nondiscrimination Statement

Portland Public Schools recognizes the diversity and worth of all individuals and groups and their roles in society. The District is committed to equal opportunity and nondiscrimination based on race; national or ethnic origin; color; sex; religion; age; sexual orientation; gender expression or identity; pregnancy; marital status; familial status; economic status or source of income; mental or physical disability or perceived disability; or military service.



Board of Education

Superintendent's Recommendation to the Board

Board Meeting Date:

February 3, 2014

Executive Committee Lead:

C.J. Sylvester, Chief Operating Officer

Department:

Office of School Modernization

Presenter/Staff Lead:

Jim Owens, Executive Director, OSM
Paul Cathcart, Project Manager, OSM

Agenda Action:

Resolution

SUBJECT: Adoption of the Comprehensive High School Education Specifications
--

BACKGROUND

Development of the District-wide Education Specifications (Ed Specs) has been conducted in two phases. Phase I was a community-wide facilities visioning process that concluded with Board adoption of the Education Facilities Vision on September 9, 2013. Phase II is development of district-wide Ed Specs (aka building design characteristics) for existing school configurations (Comprehensive High School, Middle School, Pre K-8 and Pre K-5). The document presented to the Board on January 21, 2014 was the Ed Specs for comprehensive high schools in PPS.

At the presentation of the Comprehensive High School Ed Specs to the Board on January 21, 2014, Board member conversation included some of the following:

- Call out career preparation, career technical education (CTE) as a required program component.
- Should auxiliary gyms be a required component of the Ed Spec?
- Estimate the number of teachers that would need to share classrooms.

Career Preparation / CTE

Attached (Attachment 2) are proposed changes to the Area Program:

- Page 29: Consideration of Career Preparation/CTE in the design process added to the area program introduction
- Page 33: Rename Enhanced Electives/CTE to Career Preparation/CTE and identify this portion of the Area Program as Required. Modification to footnote #1 to indicate that each comprehensive high school will contain a minimum of 6,000 SF for Career Preparation/CTE.
- Pages 44 (now identified as Career Preparation/CTE) and 45 (STEM) are relocated to pages 36 and 37, immediately following page 35, Core Program.

The Ed Spec is a foundational document for the design of comprehensive high schools. Community master planning and schematic design activities define actual program spaces. The number and type of courses comprehensive high schools offer for Career Preparation/CTE will vary by school and is dependent on student interest, anticipated career options, staffing and graduation requirements. As these course offerings will be unique to each school, the area program does not specify the number or type of instructional spaces to be devoted to this part of

the comprehensive high school program. The career preparation/CTE portion of the area program lists a non-exhaustive array of spaces that schools can choose from to meet their specific program needs. The planning and design of these spaces is typically performed at the individual school level, therefore room data sheets for these spaces are not included in the Ed Spec.

Auxiliary Gymnasium

The designation of the auxiliary gym remains as optional. Designation of auxiliary gyms as “optional” in the area program of the Ed Spec was done to provide flexibility for overall program development for comprehensive high schools. The required main gym will include two regulation courts and related seating. This gym can also be converted to seat the entire student body for special events. Currently, both Franklin and Roosevelt High School Master Plans include an auxiliary gym. Schematic design is currently in process and will be finalized through public and staff processes by April for Board review and approval.

Preferred Program

As staff noted in the presentation on January 21st, the Comprehensive High School Ed Specs strive to balance the aspirations of the PPS Education Facilities Vision and the design and program principles expressed in the high school Ed Spec focus group meetings with budget, building, and site constraints as well as program variations. Part of how this may be accomplished is by providing some flexibility via preferred and optional spaces within the area program of Ed Specs that individual schools can choose from during master planning to fulfill the specific programmatic needs of each high school.

Ideally, all spaces identified as both preferred and optional would be developed as part of each comprehensive high school in the District. However, as with almost all capital construction projects, choices need to be made to balance program needs within available resources. This kind of balancing is currently taking place as part of the Franklin and Roosevelt schematic design processes.

Teacher Work Areas/Shared Classrooms

As noted in staff’s presentation January 21st, how many teachers will share classrooms varies from school to school based on the schedule determined by the type and number of courses offered and the complexities of staffing from year to year. General classrooms have the greatest ability to be shared by teaching staff. General classrooms make up 60% of the instructional spaces in the area program of the Ed Specs and would have the highest utilization of instructional spaces in comprehensive high schools.

All teachers will have a work station in a shared, dedicated collaboration space. Teachers in more specialized classrooms such as science labs or art rooms would have a work station in the teacher collaboration space for planning purposes, but it would be unlikely they would teach in more than one classroom. Based on current scheduling models under development for Franklin High School and Roosevelt modernization projects, we do not currently forecast any teachers needing to be in more than two classrooms.

RELATED POLICIES / BOARD GOALS AND PRIORITIES

The following Board policies informed and directed the development of Education Specifications:

1. Policy 8.80.010-P “High Performance Facility Design”
 2. Resolution No. 4624 (July 9, 2012) Development of a General Obligation Bond Ballot Measure and Explanatory Statement for the November 6, 2012 Election
 3. Resolution No. 4608 (May 29, 2012) Resolution to Adopt the Superintendent’s Recommended Update of the PPS Long Range Facilities Plan
 4. Resolution No. 4800 (September 9, 2013) Resolution to Adopt the Educational Facility Vision as part of the District-wide Educational Specifications
-

PROCESS / COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

Phase II of the Ed Spec process was designed as a focus group model to work with teachers, administrators and community partners from each of the PPS school configurations. High school teachers participating in the highly successful ModLE learning symposium in February 2012 were invited to take part in the three focus group meetings on comprehensive high schools. Teachers were also invited by their principals and colleagues to be part of the conversations. Notes from these meetings can be found in Appendix C of the Comprehensive High School Ed Spec.

Leadership from the Office of Schools and District Operations provided additional feedback on the initial drafts of the comprehensive high school area program and Ed Specs.

ALIGNMENT WITH EQUITY POLICY IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

The various community involvement efforts beginning in 2007 and continuing up to the successful passage of the Capital Bond in the Fall of 2012 served to engage a diverse cross-section of the community and to identify goals and priorities that have been consistent over time. The Education Facilities Vision process in 2012/13 engaged segments of the community that to date have been under-represented as well as those that are representative of PPS’s existing and emerging constituencies in community conversations.

Development of the comprehensive high school Ed Spec began by incorporating the themes of the Education Facilities Vision process (2013) with the requirements of the High School System Design process (2010). Teachers, administrators, and community partners were asked to refine the vision themes into specific spaces needed to deliver modern program requirements in district comprehensive high schools.

BUDGET / RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS

Phase II of the Ed Spec project is 43% or \$108,902 of \$250,750 budget for the project. All meetings with teaching staff and school administrators are complete.

The Ed Spec is meant to provide guidance to design teams in master planning processes in site specific situations. Specific program requirements at individual schools in conjunction with capital budgets and construction pricing will ultimately determine the scope of what gets built at each school.

NEXT STEPS / TIMELINE / COMMUNICATION PLAN

The Ed Specs for the remaining school configurations (middle school, PreK-8, and Pre K-5) will be brought forward to the Board later this winter.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1 – Resolution

Attachment 2 – Proposed modifications to the January 21, 2014 Draft Comprehensive High School Education Specifications

AREA PROGRAM

The area program identifies the quantity and size of spaces within a comprehensive high school needed to deliver the Districts' educational program for 1,500 students. The use of 1,500 students as the target enrollment for the Ed Spec is based on the "planning capacity" identified in the District's Long Range Facilities Plan (Enrollment Forecasts & Balancing and School & Site Utilization).

The area program is meant to be used as a guide for the design of future comprehensive high schools. The District's High School System Design strives to provide parity of program at each comprehensive high school, however there will always be a certain amount of variability in student enrollment and programming between District comprehensive high schools and therefore the need to modify the elements of the area program to suit the needs of each individual school.

While the area program identifies the number and size of required spaces, these numbers will and should be adapted to meet site specific building and site constraints as well as program needs. The area program is meant to provide district-wide guidance to design teams for the delivery of high school curriculum and should be seen as a point of departure for design teams working on the modernization or replacement of comprehensive high schools. It is expected that room sizes, adjacencies, and layout will vary depending on the constraints of existing buildings.

INSTRUCTIONAL AND EDUCATIONAL SUPPORT SPACES

The area program contains specifications for instructional and educational support spaces. Instructional spaces include general classrooms, science labs, and spaces for art and physical education. Educational support areas include gymnasiums, media center, office areas, kitchen and student commons, and custodial area. The room data sheets describe the requirements, functions, relationships, equipment and size for each space. The information provided in the room data sheets should be used in conjunction with the District's Design Guidelines and Standards which provide a greater level of detail for the mechanical, electrical, plumbing, and communication requirements for new construction.

Appendix A provides guidance on what elements of the area program should be modified for the design of comprehensive high schools with student enrollments greater or less than 1,500 students.

The number and type of courses comprehensive high schools offer for career preparation and career technical education (CTE) will vary by school and is dependent on student interest, staffing and graduation requirements. As these course offerings will be unique to each school, the area program does not specify the number of type of instructional spaces to be devoted to this part of the comprehensive high school program. The career preparation and CTE portion of the area program lists the array of spaces that schools can choose from to meet their specific program needs for these course offerings. The planning and design of these spaces is typically performed at the individual school level, therefore room data sheets for these spaces are not included in the Ed Spec.

PPS Comprehensive High School(s) Area Program

AREA	Teaching Stations		
	GC *	Science	Net Area ***

SUMMARY

Required	Core (including Science) **	34	8	52,160
	Fine & Performing Arts	4		19,390
	Career Preparation / CTE ¹	3		6,000
	Athletics (includes PE SF)	3		28,380
	Ed Support	1		47,910
	Smaller Instructional Spaces	4		2,000
	Sub-Total Required	49	8	155,840

Additional	Partners-Community ²			1,200
	Wrap-Around Service Providers			4,700
				-
	Sub-Total Additional			5,900

NET TO GROSS RATIO OF 30% ³ **48,522**

Total Comprehensive High School SF (Required)	210,262
Preferred	12,660
Required + Preferred	222,922

Total Teaching Staff	49	8
----------------------	----	---

Notes:

Preferred: spaces and area preferred but not required in the area program; preferred areas not applied to area program total

Enhanced Elective Preferred: minimum 6,000 SF available to provide school program support, more program preferred as program and budget allow

Area program for 1,500 student enrollment

Curriculum terminology in this document determined per High School System Design (2010)

* Based upon 980 SF/general classroom

** Includes Teacher Workrooms @ 10 teacher offices per workroom

*** Areas identified in Area Program are preferred in new construction; it is expected the areas of rooms and spaces in existing buildings will vary from the areas identified in the area program to accommodate the floorplates and other structural limitations of existing buildings.

¹ Each Comprehensive High School will contain a minimum of 6,000 SF for career preparation / CTE. May be modified upon further research regarding STEM/CTE program requirements.

² Assumptions based upon current average SF of partners/providers in HS's or average

³ Gross includes walls, corridor, circulation

PPS Comprehensive High School(s) Area Program

AREA	Teaching Stations	QTY.	S.F. ROOM	S.F. TOTAL
------	-------------------	------	-----------	------------

CAREER PREPARATION / CTE

Each Comprehensive High School will contain a minimum of 6,000 SF for career preparation / CTE. List is not conclusive. ¹

Unique Space				
Design/Construction, Industrial 3d modeling	0	1	6,000	6,000
Introduction to Basic Equipment	0	1	4,000	4,000
Shop (various)	0	1	6,000	6,000
Sports Medicine	0	1	980	980
Culinary Arts, Farm to Table/Marketing,	0	1	1,600	1,600
Law/Courtroom	0	1	2,000	2,000
Photography Darkroom	0	1	800	800
Orchestra Room	0	1	2,400	2,400

Classroom				
Robotics	0	1	2,500	2,500
Marketing	0	1	1,500	1,500
Environmental Studies	0	1	980	980
Business	0	1	980	980
Accounting	0	1	980	980
Health Services	0	1	980	980
Peace Studies	0	1	980	980
Psychology	0	1	980	980
Future Educators	0	1	980	980
Sustainable Agriculture	0	1	3,000	3,000
Photography	0	1	980	980
Music Classroom		1	980	980

Computer Labs				
Multimedia/Web Design/Film	0	1	1,200	1,200
Digital Media	0	1	1,200	1,200
Architectural Drawing	0	1	1,200	1,200

Notes:

¹ Number of class offerings using similar type spaces may determine best use of SF available.

PPS Comprehensive High School(s) Area Program

AREA	Teaching Stations	QTY.	S.F. ROOM	S.F. TOTAL
------	-------------------	------	-----------	------------

Science Technology Engineering Math (STEM) program within comprehensive high school

STEM education is experiential, interdisciplinary, collaborative, hands-on and project based and is most successful when the specific facility and programmatic needs are developed with local industry or higher education partner(s).

General STEM spaces - applicable to all STEM focus types depending on partner(s) and program needs

Computer lab with 3D printer	0	1	1,350	1,350
Lecture Hall *	0	1	2,000	2,000
Small group work space *	0	4	350	9,000
Project Display	0	1	500	500

Engineering & Design/Construction or Manufacturing (higher ed, local industry partner(s))

STEM Lab -woods, metal fabrication, welding	0	1	4,500	4,500
Science - AP Physics *	0	1	1,000	1,000
Math - AP Calculus *	0	1	1,000	1,000
Intro to Engineering *	0	1	1,000	1,000
Alternative energy		1	1,350	1,350

Health Sciences / Biomedical (university or research partner(s))

Sports Medicine	0	1	1,200	1,200
Health *	0	1	1,000	1,000
Anatomy *	0	1	1,000	1,000
AP Physiology *	0	1	1,000	1,000
AP Chemistry *			1,000	1,000
STEM Lab - biotechnology			2,000	2,000

Automotive Services Technology or Transportation, Distribution and Logistics (higher ed., industry partner(s))

Small Engines Lab	0	1	3,500	3,500
Electronic Trades	0	1	1,000	1,000
Mechanic	0	1	1,000	1,000
Sustainable transportation	0	1	1,750	1,750

Information Technology Studies (technology partner(s))

Computer labs *		3	1,100	3,300
Software engineering *		1	1,000	1,000
Web and digital communications lab		1	1,200	1,200

* Comprehensive high school program space capable of being used for STEM program needs

Notes:

- 1 Number of class offerings using similar type spaces may determine best use of SF available.
- 2 Space/room SF are estimates used as placeholders and will need to be designed to meet actual program needs.



MEMORANDUM

Date: January 2, 2014
To: Sue Ann Higgins, Chief Academic Officer
From: Judy Brennan, Enrollment Director
Subject: 2014 Interdistrict transfer status report and recommendations

In 2011 and 2013, the Oregon Legislature passed new laws regarding student transfers across district lines. Of particular note:

- Each year by February 1, districts must announce whether they will participate in an open enrollment lottery that allows students to transfer into a different district without receiving permission from their resident district.
- Beginning in 2014, districts cannot ask for or use information about a non-resident student's demographics, background or abilities when considering a transfer request.
- The legislature is expected to take up the issue again in the coming special session and provide additional guidelines for inter-district transfers.

In the long-term, PPS interdistrict transfer rules will change as part of the broader enrollment and transfer overhaul being undertaken by Superintendent's Advisory Committee on Enrollment and Transfer (SACET). However, short-term decisions are needed to bring 2014 practices into compliance with recent laws. This memo contains background and recommendations on inter-district transfer issues that must be resolved in advance of the 2014-15 transfer cycle:

Open Enrollment

The provision to allow school districts to accept non-resident students without seeking permission from resident districts was approved by the legislature in 2011 and is scheduled to sunset in 2017. PPS did not participate in open enrollment in the 2012 or 2013 transfer cycles. However, several nearby districts have accepted PPS resident students through open enrollment, increasing the overall numbers of students transferring out of PPS by a third between 2011 and 2012 (see attachment 1).

In addition to open enrollment, PPS has seen fewer net interdistrict transfers as other districts have tightened restrictions on allowing students to attend schools elsewhere. However, these reductions have come at the same time as continued overall enrollment growth in PPS.

An analysis of students approved to other districts through open enrollment found that about half were former residents of other districts who are staying in schools they attended prior to moving in to the PPS boundary. The remaining group of students had not been attending a PPS school prior to applying for open enrollment transfer, including students in private schools and those paying tuition to attend other public schools.

Open enrollment is a limited transfer option during a specific lottery cycle, and does not affect students who move or seek transfer at other times. Since space is very limited in most PPS schools, the number of non-resident students approved during the annual lottery has dropped in the past four years (see attachment 2). While open enrollment would allow PPS to retain students for longer periods without seeking permission from their resident districts, it would not necessarily lead to more transfers since open enrollment rules require that resident students be placed before non-residents.

Lottery compatibility

The existing PPS transfer process is incompatible with state rules that, beginning this year, will apply not just to open enrollment applicants but to all students seeking transfer in or out of PPS. In the current lottery system, weights are applied to promote socio-economic and gender balance and staff can review a student's IEP to ensure there is appropriate space in the requested school.

Enrollment and transfer policies are expected to be revised substantially in 2014, but the changes will not take effect until 2015. In the meantime, a separate lottery is recommended for non-resident students who wish to transfer into PPS for the 2014-15 school year. A reasonable timeframe for an interdistrict transfer lottery would have it occur in late March-early April, after the upcoming special legislative session ends and the PPS lottery application period closes. It should include only openings at schools/programs that were not filled during the PPS lottery, to reduce confusion and false hopes for non-resident applicants.

Unfortunately, this timeframe for a separate interdistrict transfer lottery is outside the state rules which require open enrollment transfer slots to be announced by March 1. Thus, students who participate in a separate lottery outside the open enrollment window would still need to receive permission from their resident district to transfer into PPS.

Non-lottery interdistrict agreements

According to a law approved last summer that will take effect in September 2014, districts are no longer allowed to look at student demographics or history when deciding whether to approve or deny a non-resident transfer request. Currently, PPS screens non-resident applicants for attendance, behavior and academic achievement information, and can deny a transfer request if a student has not met minimal standards. Additionally, the new law states that all new interdistrict applicants have to be approved through a lottery mechanism. Since most interdistrict requests are from students who have moved in or out of the district and wish to remain at their current school, it is unclear how a lottery mechanism would work for these mid-year requests. We expect greater clarity to come out of the coming special legislative session.

Recommendations

Given the continued uncertainty around new interdistrict agreement laws, and the coming changes to PPS enrollment and transfer policy, I recommend that PPS continue to opt out of the open enrollment provision. Instead, we should commit to offering non-resident students a separate interdistrict transfer lottery in late March-early April, and offers clear and realistic choices to non-resident students. Outside of a lottery, I recommend that we commit resources to updating forms and procedures and provide training for front office school staff, to ensure that we effectively implement new state laws regarding interdistrict transfers.

Please contact me with questions or concerns.

Attachment

Cc: Harriet Adair, Jon Isaacs, Amanda Whalen, David Williams

DRAFT

RESOLUTION No.

Inter-District Transfer Procedures for 2014-15 School Year

RECITALS

- A. Each year, PPS responds to more than 1,000 requests for interdistrict transfers, both for students who live within the PPS boundary to attend schools in other districts and for students from other districts to attend schools here. During the 2012-13 school year, nearly 800 non-resident students attended PPS schools with the approval of their resident district through the standard interdistrict transfer process.
- B. In June 2011, the Oregon Legislature approved House Bill 3681, which offered a new option for enrolling students from other districts, commonly referred to as “Open Enrollment”. The new option allows a district to accept non-resident students without consent of their resident district. It requires:
- A spring timeframe for announcing space, accepting applicants, running a lottery (if more applicants than space) and providing results,
 - Approval through 12th grade, without the need for annual renewal, that cannot be revoked by the non-resident or resident district,
 - Resident applicants must be accepted before non-resident applicants,
 - No weighting, preference or denial can be given based on student demographics, including race, gender and family income level, or special program status, including disability, English language proficiency or athletic ability.
- C. By March 1, 2014, the School Board must determine whether PPS will participate in the “Open Enrollment” option for the 2014-15 school year. If the district chooses to participate, PPS must also announce the spaces available by school on that date.
- D. 226 PPS resident students have transferred to other districts through open enrollment in the two years since the program. The majority were student who had been approved by PPS to attend another district in the prior year, or who had been paying tuition at other schools.
- E. Participating in “Open Enrollment” has the potential to offset enrollment loss of students approved to other districts. Because resident applicants must be accepted before non-residents, open enrollment could ~~have a~~ destabilize efforts to balance enrollment between PPS schools.
- F. In June 2013, the Oregon Legislature approved House Bill 2747 which changes interdistrict transfer rules for all students, not just those applying through open enrollment, beginning in the 2014-15 school year. The legislature is slated to take up an additional bill regarding interdistrict transfers during the February 2014 special session.
- G. Current PPS enrollment systems, including the annual lottery, require changes in order to be compliant with House Bill 2747, and other legislation currently in review. The Board Policy on Student Enrollment and Transfers, 4.10.051 – P, Section VII establishes that students who are residents of the district will be given highest

priority. Non-resident students are only considered after resident students are placed. In accordance with the priorities established in this policy, the District will run a separate lottery for non-resident students following the completion of the lottery cycle for resident students.

- H. Superintendent Smith recommends that PPS opt-out of the “Open Enrollment” program for the 2014-15 school year, to avoid enrollment instability in advance of a planned district-wide boundary review.
- I. Superintendent Smith further recommends that staff revise enrollment systems as necessary to comply with requirements in recent and anticipated legislation, including running a separate lottery for non-resident students, and to share with the Board later in the year the impact of those laws.

RESOLUTION

- A. The Board of Directors for Portland Public Schools accepts the [Superintendent's recommendation forwarded by Superintendent Smith](#) to continue to offer our existing system for non-resident students to access PPS schools and to opt out of the interdistrict transfer option known as “Open Enrollment” for the 2014-15 school year, as provided through House Bill 3681.
- B. The Board accepts the Superintendent’s recommendation to revise existing enrollment systems to comply with recent and anticipated laws regarding interdistrict transfers, and to report the impact of the laws no later than December 2014.

S, Higgs
1/31/2014

**PPS LOTTERY APPLICANTS AND APPROVALS: Residents of other districts
2010-11 through 2013-14**

Lottery Year	APPLICANTS						APPROVALS					
	K-8		HS		TOTAL		K-8		HS		TOTAL	
	ALL	Non-Resident	ALL	Non-Resident	ALL	Non-Resident	ALL	Non-Resident	ALL	Non-Resident	ALL	Non-Resident
2010-11	2776	150	1125	43	3901	193	1835	69	749	25	2584	94
2011-12	2707	137	811	30	3518	167	1627	55	478	10	2105	65
2012-13	2727	153	518	25	3245	178	1389	57	390	14	1779	71
2013-14	2755	136	581	22	3336	158	1309	43	415	12	1724	55

**INTER-DISTRICT TRANSFER IN AND OUT OF PPS
2010-11 through 2013-14 School Years**

School District	2013-14 Inter-District Transfers Through December 20, 2013				2012-13 Inter-District Transfers				2011-12 Inter-District Transfers			2010-11 Inter-District Transfers				
	HB 3681	Routine inter- district process	Total	IN	NET	HB 3681	Routine inter- district process	Total	IN	NET	OUT	IN	NET	OUT	IN	NET
Beaverton		10	10	48	38	7	7	14	85	71	18	120	102	13	127	114
Centennial		4	4	78	74		5	5	91	86	2	85	83	3	85	82
Colton							1	1		-1		3	3			
Corbett	4		4		-4	4		4	1	-3		1	1			
Crook County					0	1	3	4		-4	5		-5			
David Douglas	24	37	61	241	180	54	36	90	247	157	76	249	173	67	303	236
Gaston						1		1		-1	1		-1			
Gladstone		3	3	1	-2		1	1	1	0		3	3		1	1
Gresham-Barlow	2	6	8	25	17	4	4	8	33	25	3	25	22	4	38	34
Hillsboro	1	3	4	11	7	3	1	4	15	11	2	12	10	1	15	14
Lake Oswego	41	8	49	7	-42	32	16	48	13	-35	11	8	-3	7	13	6
North Bend (ORVA)														41		-41
North Clackamas		5	5	92	87		18	18	111	93	16	123	107	20	139	119
North Marion									2	2		4	4		4	4
Oregon City		3	3	9	6			0	7	7	2	7	5	3	7	4
Oregon Trail				2	2		1	1	1	0	1	2	1		1	1
Parkrose		8	8	33	25		18	18	58	40	17	59	42	21	87	66
Reynolds		2	2	48	46		1	1	98	97	2	93	91	2	127	125
Riverdale	8	1	9		-9	12	1	13	1	-12	3	1	-2	3	3	0
Scappoose				3	3		1	1	3	2		1	1	2	7	5
Sherwood		1	1		-1	1	1	2		-2		1	1		3	3
St. Helens				2	2			0	2	2	1	2	1	1	3	2
Tigard-Tualatin	2	3	5	14	9	2	1	3	23	20	0	22	22		20	20
West Linn / Wilson	12	1	13	3	-10	11	1	12	3	-9	5	5	0	3	9	6
Woodburn								0	1	1	1		-1			
All others*		2	2	3	1				1					1	6	
Total	94	97	191	620	429	132	117	249	797	548	166	826	660	191	998	807

NOTE: DOES NOT INCLUDE TRANSFERS IN TO PPS CHARTER SCHOOLS

*Banks, Estacada, Lebanon, Molalla, North Wasco, Silver Falls, Yamhill-Carlton



PORTLAND PUBLIC SCHOOLS NUTRITION SERVICES

Director: Gitta Grether-Sweeney, MS, RD

501 North Dixon Street / Portland, OR 97227

Mailing Address: PO Box 3107 / Portland, OR 97208

Phone: 503.916.3399 Fax: 503.916.3420

Providing delicious, high quality, nutrient-rich meals in support of student learning

January 27, 2014

To: PPS School Board

From: Gitta Grether-Sweeney, MS, RD, Director, Nutrition Services

Re: Food Allergies Protocols

See below for answers to questions related to providing peanut-free food environments for schools that allow students to eat in the classroom.

Current District Practices to manage food allergies

Portland Public Schools practices are aligned with national recommendations from the Center of Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) and the Food Allergy & Anaphylaxis Network (FAAN) and other national policy guides. Food bans are not recommended by the experts in food allergy management since they have the potential of creating a false sense of security by suggesting the entire school is allergen-free.

The district uses a team approach to keep students safe and reduce the risk of potentially life-threatening allergic reactions to food or other allergens at school. The team may consist of a school administrator/designee, school nurse, parent/guardian and nutrition services staff. Teacher(s), school counselor or child development specialist and physician may also be included. The district directive www.pps.k12.or.us/files/board/3_60_061_AD.pdf outlines potential responsibilities for each member of the team and the importance of individualized plans for students with life threatening allergies.

Portland Public Schools menus are posted online for families to check for the eight major foods or food groups that the Food and Drug Administration requires on food labels because they are the foods most likely to result in severe or potentially life-threatening reactions. The foods are milk, eggs, fish, shellfish, tree nuts (including, but not limited to, almonds, walnuts, pecans), peanuts, wheat and soybeans. There are as many as 160 documented food allergens so it is not recommended to ban all food allergens from school meal programs.

Schools and meals where food is being served in the classroom

Lunch only: Beverly Cleary @ Hollywood

Lunch and Breakfast: Pioneer Programs, Ramona

Breakfast only schools that serve breakfast at no charge to all enrolled students: Alliance @ Meek, Arleta, Beach, Benson, Boise-Eliot/Humboldt, Bridger, Cesar Chavez, Chief Joseph/Ockley Green, Creston, Faubion, Franklin, George, Grout, Harrison Park, James John, Jefferson, Kelly, King, Lane, Lee, Lent, Madison, Marysville, Peninsula, Rigler, Roosevelt, Rosa Parks, Scott, Sitton, Vernon, Vestal, Whitman, Woodlawn and Woodmere.

USDA and Portland Public Schools are equal opportunity providers and employers.

Food options that would need to be eliminated

Foods that are "peanut-free" do not contain peanuts, peanut butter, peanut oil or any form or derivative of peanut or "traces of peanut." If the ingredient label states "May contain traces of nuts or peanuts" or "made in a facility that also processes peanuts and nuts," the food must be treated as if it "contains nuts or peanuts." Current food options that meet this definition include: PB&J Uncrustables, Bob's Red Mill granola, Fairlight Bakery Zac O'Mega bars and other foods prepared in bakeries such as muffins. Please note, USDA breakfast requires that two servings of whole grains be served daily for breakfast.

The total cost to provide peanut-free food in these schools.

The potential cost of eliminating PB&J Uncrustables as a lunch option ranges from \$640,000 to \$1.2 million annually depending on the ability to offset lost participation. Peanut butter is a universally popular food choice with children and accounts for about 12% of lunches daily. The potential increased cost of replacing PBJ Uncrustables with an alternate such as sun butter, soy butter or no-nuts peabutter could be \$63,000 for food costs only not including costs for labor and benefits to prepare and wrap sandwiches. The potential benefit cost due to increased labor could be \$12,000 per school at up to 70 additional schools or \$840,000.

**Life Threatening Allergies****3.60.061-AD Life Threatening Allergies**

Portland Public schools will utilize team approaches to reduce the risk of potentially life-threatening allergic reactions to food or other allergens at school. Food allergies affect an estimated two to four percent of children. The most common allergies are those to peanuts, milk, nuts, eggs, fish and shellfish, wheat and soy. For potentially life-threatening food allergies, meals and snacks sent from home are the safest option. Following the procedures and guidelines in this directive will help minimize students' potentially life-threatening reactions to foods at school.

I. Definitions

A. Allergy An exaggerated immune response or reaction to substances that are generally not harmful.

B. Licensed Medical Authority In Oregon, recognized medical authorities are physicians, physician assistants, registered dietitians, nurse practitioners and registered nurses.

C. Potentially life-threatening allergy A sudden, severe whole-body reaction to a substance, through ingesting, inhaling or skin contact, which can result in death. Also called "Anaphylaxis/Anaphylactic Reaction," symptoms may include severe itching, hives, sweating, swelling of the throat, breathing difficulties, lowered blood pressure, unconsciousness and even death.

D. Major food allergens Eight foods or food groups identified by the Food and Drug Administration as accounting for 90 percent of all documented food allergies in the U.S. and representing the foods most likely to result in severe or potentially life-threatening reactions. They are milk, eggs, fish, shellfish, tree nuts (including, but not limited to, almonds, walnuts, pecans), peanuts, wheat and soybeans.

E. Team Approach A way to manage potentially life-threatening food allergies at school using the active involvement, knowledge and professional expertise of school, health services, and nutrition services staff, parents/guardians and, if appropriate, the student.

II. General Requirements

Based on input from the school nurse and/or parent guardian, the principal will assess which team members are needed to plan prevention of and response to the allergic reactions. The team may consist of a school administrator/designee, school nurse, parent/guardian and nutrition services staff. Teacher(s), school counselor or

child development specialist and physician may also be included. The student may be included, if old enough and developmentally able to participate.

III. Family's Responsibility

A. The parent/guardian of a child with a potentially life-threatening food allergy is responsible for notifying the school nurse or building administrator or allergies that may result in a medical condition requiring intervention and/or accommodation at school and for participating as part of the team to address the child's needs.

B. The Student Registration Form must be completed and updated every year, and more often if there are changes, with special attention to the emergency contact information and "Medical Information" section, notably

1. "Serious Allergy" and the kind of allergy
2. "Medications at School"

C. Parents/guardians of students with potentially life-threatening food allergies must also provide the school with documentation from a licensed medical authority if special foods or meal substitutions are requested. The documentation must be recorded or attached to the "Medical Statement for Students with Disabilities Requiring Special Foods in Child Nutrition Programs." The form, available from Nutrition Services at every school, must include

1. the diagnosis with a description of the patient's disability and the major life activity affected by the disability
2. how the disability restricts the diet
3. foods to be omitted from the diet
4. foods to be substituted

D. Families must provide properly labeled medications and replace them after use or upon expiration.

E. Parents/guardians are also responsible for teaching their children self-management including

1. what foods cause a reaction; safe and unsafe foods,
2. the importance of avoiding unsafe ones,
3. symptoms of allergic reactions,

4. how and when to tell an adult they may be having an allergy-related problem
5. which adults at school may help them make food choices and from whom they may accept food
6. how to read food labels, as age appropriate

IV. School's Responsibility

A. Principal, principal's designee or school nurse after receiving notification and documentation that a child has a potentially life-threatening allergy, will work with the parent/guardian to develop a written plan that will

1. minimize the specific risks to the child; for example, addressing ways to limit the child's exposure to food(s) containing the specific allergen
2. identify the actions to take in the event of an allergic reaction by the child
3. anticipate school-related events, including, but not limited to field trips, and identify appropriate strategies for managing the food allergy
4. communicate the child's condition to school staff in contact with the student
5. communicate the child's condition to other students in the child's classroom when appropriate as determined by the principal. Such information shall only be shared if the parents of the student with the potentially life-threatening food allergy agree to this communication and provide a signed release of such medical information.
6. provide this staff with awareness of the child's emergency plan and information about how to recognize the symptoms of and respond to an allergic reaction
7. identify building staff that have been trained to perform first aid or life-saving techniques, specifically those who are epinephrine-trained or designated to respond to food allergy emergencies
8. identify building staff to help the child make food choices and from whom the child may accept food
9. designate the location of the student's emergency kit, containing epinephrine, prescribed by his or her physician and accompanied by the physician's order. Medications must be properly stored and kept in

a secure location, quickly accessible to identified school personnel. Students, if old enough and developmentally able, may be allowed to carry their own epinephrine, with the approval from their physician, parent/guardian, school administrator and school nurse

10. require calling 911 and contacting the parent/guardian if a potentially life-threatening allergic reaction occurs
11. evaluate whether the student is eligible for a 504 plan and
12. take any other steps determined necessary by the principal.

B. School staff can help minimize exposure to food allergens by

1. discouraging students from sharing or trading food and utensils during the meal/snack times and all events involving food, including, but not limited to, field trips, parties and celebrations
2. promoting proper hand washing before and after eating
3. keeping classroom and lunch table surfaces clean and sanitized.

C. Nutrition Services staff shall follow Federal guidelines issued by the U.S. Department of Agriculture Food and Nutrition Services for serving children with potentially life-threatening allergies diagnosed by a licensed medical authority. Generally, students with food allergies or intolerances are not "disabled persons" and school districts are not required to make substitutions for them. However, if a physician assesses that food allergies may result in severe potentially life-threatening reactions (anaphylactic reactions), the student may then meet the definition of "disabled person" and the food service personnel must make the substitutions prescribed by the physician.

1. The medical food substitution order written by a licensed medical authority will be kept on file in the cafeteria, in the school office and with the school nurse.
2. A confidential allergy alert will be placed in the school cafeteria's computerized student meal account system.
3. If special foods or meal substitutions are requested, cafeteria staff will consult with Nutrition Services dietitians to screen food labels for product ingredients that may contain allergens to be avoided.

V. Student's Responsibility

A. Students with potentially life-threatening food allergies should be proactive in the care and management of their food allergies and reactions, based on their developmental level, and

1. not trade food with others
2. not eat anything with unknown ingredients or known to contain any allergen
3. not accept food from other students or from adults not authorized to approve their food choices
4. notify an adult immediately if they eat something they believe may contain the food to which they allergic.

Legal References: Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq; Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990; Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, 29 U.S.C. 794 (a), PL 93-112 Food Allergen Labeling and Consumer Protection Act (FALCPA) of 2004 United States Department of Agriculture Food and Nutrition Service, Accommodating Children with Special Dietary Needs in the School Nutrition Programs, Guidance for School Food Service Staff

History: Adopted 9/06, Amd. 8/07



Board of Education

Staff Report to the Board

Board Meeting Date: February 2, 2014

Executive Committee Lead: Neil Sullivan

Department: Purchasing & Contracting

Presenter/Staff Lead: Elaine Baker

SUBJECT: Resolution to Adopt Revised Public Contracting Rules

BACKGROUND

Staff asks the Board to adopt revised Public Contracting Rules ('February 2014 Rules'). These rules comprise the Purchasing Manual referenced in Policy 8.50.100-P and govern the District's purchasing and contracting activities. If adopted, these rules will replace the 2012 Portland Public Schools Purchasing and Contracting Rules.

RELATED POLICIES / BOARD GOALS AND PRIORITIES

District Policy 8.50.090-P designates the Board as the local government contract review board with authority to adopt rules for public contracts and purchasing, as per ORS 279A.060.

PROCESS / COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

The February 2014 Rules vary from the 2012 version in one aspect only. On page 35, PPS-47-0250 (1)(c) and on page 50, PPS-47-0265 (1), the threshold for Small Procurements for Goods and Services is raised from \$5,000 to \$10,000.

The 2013 Legislature updated state statute ORS 279B.065, recognizing public agency need for increased efficiencies when making small purchases and the realities of inflation, since the previous such update, sixteen years ago.

This change will allow the District to make small purchases, of Goods and Services up to \$10,000, directly rather than going through a competitive process. It does not mandate that we do so; it merely allows flexibility when time and other constraints make a competitive bid practice impractical.

It is also important to note that this does apply to personal services, architecture or engineering consulting, or public improvements.

ALIGNMENT WITH EQUITY POLICY IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

This change is in alignment with the District's Equity in Public Purchasing & Contracting Policy. Owners of minority and women-owned businesses, as well as small business advocacy groups,

Reviewed and Approved by
Executive Committee Lead

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Neil A. Sullivan".

have requested the District consider more direct contracting because it allows project managers and others to specifically utilize local minority, women and emerging small businesses.

BUDGET / RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS

This flexibility will allow us to greater utilize our scarce project management resources in order to quickly and efficiently make minor purchases of Goods and Services.

NEXT STEPS / TIMELINE / COMMUNICATION PLAN

The February 2014 Rules are scheduled for a first reading at the February 3rd Board Meeting. A second reading will be scheduled a minimum 30 days later, at a March board meeting at which the revised rules may be proposed for adoption(see attached resolution). If adopted, these revised rules will replace those currently posted on the District website.

The Attorney General Model Rules are currently under revision, with anticipated completion in the summer of 2014. Staff expects to return to the Board at that time, with a second proposed revision, in order to align District rules with the new changes.

QUESTIONS FOR BOARD DISCUSSION

ATTACHMENTS

1. Resolution
2. Exhibit A: Page 35 and page 50 of 2012 PPS Public Contracting Rules, redlined to show proposed changes.

RESOLUTION NO.

Resolution to Adopt Revised Public Contracting Rules

RECITALS

- A. The Board of Directors of School District No. 1, Multnomah County, Oregon (“District”) acts as the Local Public Contract Review Board (“Board”) pursuant to ORS 279A.060.
- B. ORS 279A.065 empowers public contracting agencies to adopt rules of procedure for public contracts; the District has adopted the 2012 Portland Public Schools Public Contracting Rules as such.
- C. The state legislature revised ORS 279B.065 in 2013, increasing the threshold for small Goods and Services procurements from \$5,000 to \$10,000.
- D. In order for staff to implement this change, and utilize the new threshold, it must have Board approval.
- E. The Board deems it advisable to adopt updated Rules (“February 2014 Rules”) in order that staff may make small Goods and Services purchases more efficiently and effectively.

RESOLUTION

1. The Board hereby adopts this change to the 2012 Portland Public Schools Public Contracting Rules, attached as Exhibit A.
2. This amended Rule supersedes and replaces the District’s 2012 Rule, for procurements advertised or first solicited on or after the effective date of this Resolution. Procurements advertised or first solicited prior to the effective date of this Resolution shall continue to be processed under the 2012 Rules.

Portland Public Schools Public Contracting Rules
Division 49 – Public Contracting Rules for Contracts for Goods and/or Services
Other Than Personal Services

PPS DIVISION 47

**PUBLIC CONTRACTING RULES FOR CONTRACTS FOR GOODS AND/OR
SERVICES OTHER THAN PERSONAL SERVICES**

PPS-47-0000 Generally

These Division 47 Rules implement ORS 279B applicable to public Procurements for Goods or Services, or both.

PPS-47-0250 Methods of Source Selection

- (1) Except as permitted in these Rules, the District must Award a Public Contract for Goods or Services, or both, by one of the following sourcing methods:
- (a) Competitive Sealed Bidding (also known as Invitation to Bid or ITB) pursuant to ORS 279B.055 and PPS-47-0255 and -0257;
 - (b) Competitive Sealed Proposals (also known as Request for Proposals or RFP) pursuant to ORS 279B.060 and PPS-47-0260 through 0263;
 - (c) ~~Small Procurements (\$5,000 or less) pursuant to ORS 279B.065 and PPS 47-0265;~~ Small Procurements (\$10,000 or less) pursuant to ORS 279B.065 and PPS-47-0265;
 - (d) Intermediate Procurements (more than \$5,000 to \$150,000) pursuant to ORS 279B.070 and PPS-47-0270;
 - (e) Sole-source Procurement pursuant to ORS 279B.075 and PPS-47-0275;
 - (f) Emergency Procurement pursuant to ORS 279B.080 and PPS-47-0280;
 - (g) Special Procurement pursuant to ORS 279B.085 and PPS-47-0285, including the Class Special Procurements set forth in PPS-47-0288; or
 - (h) Cooperative Procurement pursuant to ORS 279A.200 and PPS-46-0400 through PPS-46-0480.

PPS-47-0252 Procurement of Service Contracts Over \$250,000 in Compliance with ORS 279B.030 through ORS 279B.036

(1) Unless the District determines that it is not feasible to perform the Services with the District's own personnel and resources pursuant to Section (4) of this Rule, before conducting a Procurement of a Contract for Services with an estimated Contract Price that exceeds \$250,000 the District shall conduct a Written cost analysis in accordance with Section (2) of this Rule. The cost analysis must compare an estimate of the District's cost in performing the Services with an estimate of the cost that a potential Contractor would incur in performing the Services. The District may proceed with the Procurement only if it determines that the District would incur more cost in performing the Services with its own personnel and resources than in procuring the Services from a Contractor. For the purposes of this Section, "Contract for Services" does not include:

- (a) Contracts for Personal Services as defined in PPS-46-0500.
- (b) Contracts for Services exempted from compliance with the Public Contracting Code by ORS 197.025 or other state statute.
- (c) Procurements for Client Services as defined in OAR 125-246-0110. "Client Services" means any Services that directly or primarily support a Client, whether or not the Client is the recipient through the provision of voluntary or mandatory Services. Client Services also means any Goods

Portland Public Schools Public Contracting Rules
Division 49 – Public Contracting Rules for Contracts for Goods and/or Services
Other Than Personal Services

- (a) Addenda to the Request for Proposals. After receipt of unpriced technical Proposals, Addenda to the Request for Proposals shall be distributed only to Proposers who submitted unpriced technical Proposals.
- (b) Receipt and Handling of Unpriced Technical Proposals. Unpriced technical Proposals need not be opened publicly.
- (c) Evaluation of Unpriced Technical Proposals. Unpriced technical Proposals shall be evaluated solely in accordance with the criteria set forth in the Request for Proposals.
- (d) Discussion of Unpriced Technical Proposals. The District may seek clarification of a technical Proposal of any Proposer who submits a qualified, or potentially qualified, technical Proposal. During the course of such discussions, the District shall not disclose any information derived from one unpriced technical Proposal to any other Proposer.
- (e) Methods of Contractor Selection for Phase One. In conducting phase one, the District may employ any combination of the methods of Contractor selection that call for the establishment of a Competitive Range or include discussions, negotiations, or best and final Offers as set forth in this Rule.
- (f) Procedure for Phase Two. On the completion of phase one, the District shall invite each qualified Proposer to submit price Proposals. The District shall conduct phase two as any other Competitive Sealed Proposal Procurement except as set forth in this Rule.
- (g) No public notice need be given of the request to submit Price Proposals because such notice was previously given.

PPS-47-0265 Small Procurements

- (1) **Generally**. For Procurements of Goods and Services less than or equal to ~~\$5,000~~ \$10,000, the District may Award a Contract as a Small Procurement in any manner deemed practical or convenient by the District, including by direct selection or Award.
- (2) **Amendments**. The District may amend a Contract Awarded as a Small Procurement in accordance with PPS-47-0800, but the cumulative amendments must not increase the total Contract Price to greater than \$6,000.
- (3) **No Fragmentation**. A Procurement may not be artificially divided or fragmented so as to constitute a Small Procurement. See ORS 279B.065(2).

PPS-47-0270 Intermediate Procurements

- (1) **Generally**. For Procurements of Goods and Services greater than \$5,000 and less than or equal to \$150,000, the District may Award a Contract as an Intermediate Procurement pursuant to ORS 279B.070.
- (2) **Intermediate Solicitation Process**. When conducting an Intermediate Procurement, the District shall seek at least three informally solicited Competitive Price Quotes or Competitive Proposals from prospective Contractors. The District shall keep a Written record of the sources of the Quotes or Proposals received. If three Quotes or Proposals are not reasonably available, fewer will suffice, but the District shall make a Written record of the effort made to obtain the Quotes or Proposals.
- (3) **Written Solicitations**. For Intermediate Procurements equal to or exceeding \$75,000, the District shall use a Written solicitation to obtain Quotes, Bids, or Proposals.
- (4) **Negotiations**. The District may negotiate with a prospective Contractor who offers to provide Goods or Services in response to an Intermediate Procurement to clarify its Quote or Offer or to effect modifications that will make the Quote or Offer more advantageous to the District.

Portland Public School District 1st Reading

DATE: February 3, 2014

Notice of Proposed Policy and Public Comment for Revised Public Contracting Rules Board Policy 8.50.100-P

The Portland Public School District is providing Notice of Proposed Policy and Public Comment to offer interested parties reasonable opportunity to submit data or comments on the proposed policies noted below.

Public comment may be submitted in writing directly to the district or through the district Web site noted below. Written comments must be submitted by 5:00 p.m. on the Last Date for Comment listed below.

1st Reading by: Pam Knowles, Co-Chair, Portland Public School Board
Summary: Revised Public Contract Rules; Policy 8.50.100-P

Draft Policy Web Site:

<http://www.pps.k12.or.us/departments/board/872.htm>

(click on draft policy link)

Recommended for 1st Reading by: Board of Education

Policy Contact: Caren Huson

Last Date for Comment: February 24, 2014

Address: P.O. Box 3107, Portland, OR 97208-3107

Telephone: 503-916-3741

E-mail: chusonqu@pps.net

Last Date for Comment: February 24, 2014



Board of Education

Superintendent's Recommendation to the Board

Board Meeting Date: February 24, 2014

Executive Committee Lead: Neil Sullivan

Department: CFO / Finance Administration

Presenter/Staff Lead: Neil Sullivan

Agenda Action: Resolution Policy

SUBJECT: Portland Public Schools is required to pass a resolution indicating support for the mix of services to be provided by the Multnomah Education Service District (MESD) as detailed in the [Multnomah ESD Local Service Plan 2014-15](#).

BRIEF SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATION

Each year the MESD develops a Local Service Plan (LSP) for review, modification, and approval by the MESD Superintendents' Council. The LSP lists and explains the mix of services that MESD may provide to the school districts within their service area. The Superintendent recommends adopting the 2014-15 MESD Local Service Plan as approved by the Superintendents' Council of the MESD.

BACKGROUND

It is the practice of the District to obtain appropriate available services from the list available from the MESD to attain efficiencies using the cooperative membership with other districts served by the MESD. Adoption does not imply the district is obligated to each of the services offered by the LSP; the District will select services and manner of funding each of the selected services. The selection of each specific service for the District Service Plan will be included in the adopted budget for 2014-15.

RELATED POLICIES / BOARD GOALS AND PRIORITIES

ORS 334.175 requires the Board of Directors to annually adopt the regionalized component programs and services proposal agreement and understandings as approved by the MESD Superintendents' Council. The resolution is required to be passed by the Board by March 1st of each year for the services that may be provided in the following fiscal year.

PROCESS / COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

There was no community engagement in developing this recommendation.

Reviewed and Approved by
Superintendent

Date:

ALIGNMENT WITH EQUITY POLICY IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

MESD's proposed services are intended to provide maximum choice and flexibility to meet individual district needs, assisting the District in meeting its goal of providing every student with equitable access to high quality and culturally relevant instruction, curriculum, support, facilities and other educational resources, even when this means differentiating resources.

BUDGET / RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS

The District may utilize funds sent to the MESD for the purposes of providing cooperative services to the local component districts. The District consumes all available resources through the MESD as appropriate and in conjunction with the development of the 2014-15 budget.

NEXT STEPS / TIMELINE / COMMUNICATION PLAN

This change would be effective for the fiscal year 2014/15 and initial dates will be provided in 2014/15 Approved Budget.

ATTACHMENTS

Resolution No. XXXX: Annual Multnomah Education Service District Resolution Process

The link to the MESD LSP is: <http://www.mesd.k12.or.us/comm/2014-15-MESDLocal-Service-Plan.pdf> .

RESOLUTION No. XXXX

Annual Multnomah Education Service District Resolution Process

RECITALS

- A. Annually, the Multnomah Education Service District (MESD) provides a list of resolution services in the Local Service Plan (LSP) to the MESD Superintendents' Council for the Council's review, modification(s), and approval.
- B. The services offered in the LSP require approval of the component districts' boards by March 1, annually. The Services offered in the LSP must be adopted by two thirds of component districts' boards.
- C. Attached is the signed, "Agreements and Understanding" of the Annual MESD Resolution Process as approved by the MESD Superintendents' Council.
- D. A separate list of the specific services for Portland Public Schools, or the District Service Plan, will be included in the 2014-15 budget development process.
- E. This particular resolution does not commit Portland Public Schools to each of the specific services offered by MESD. This resolution affirms the overall services offered to all of the local component districts and contains the terms of the LSP offered by the MESD.

RESOLUTION

- 1. Be it resolved that, according to ORS 334.175, the Board of Directors of Portland Public Schools, School District No. 1J, Multnomah County, Oregon, agrees to the conditions and provision of all programs and services, described in the 2014-15 Local Service Plan – Multnomah Education Service District with no exceptions.
- 2. In the event that the required resources are not available, each and every program and service is subject to reduction or elimination at the discretion of the Multnomah ESD Board. If such reductions or eliminations are necessary, they will be made through contingency planning in cooperation with the Superintendents of the local component districts.

N. Sullivan

BOARD OF EDUCATION
SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 1J, MULTNOMAH COUNTY, OREGON

INDEX TO THE AGENDA

February 3, 2014

Board Action Number	Page
---------------------------	------

Purchases, Bids, Contracts

4870	Revenue Contracts that Exceed \$25,000 Limit for Delegation of Authority.....	3
------	---	---

Other Items Requiring Board Action

4871	Resolution to Adopt District Education Specifications for Comprehensive High Schools	5
------	--	---

Purchases, Bids, Contracts

The Superintendent RECOMMENDS adoption of the following item:

Number 4870

RESOLUTION No. 4870

Revenue Contracts that Exceed \$25,000 Limit for Delegation of Authority

RECITAL

Portland Public Schools (“District”) Public Contracting Rules PPS-45-0200 (“Authority to Approve District Contracts; Delegation of Authority to Superintendent”) requires the Board of Education (“Board”) to enter into and approve all contracts, except as otherwise expressly authorized. Contracts exceeding \$25,000 per contractor are listed below.

RESOLUTION

The Superintendent recommends that the Board approve these contracts. The Board accepts this recommendation and by this resolution authorizes the Deputy Clerk to enter into agreements in a form approved by General Counsel for the District.

NEW REVENUE CONTRACTS

No New Revenue Contracts

NEW INTERGOVERNMENTAL AGREEMENTS / REVENUE (“IGA/Rs”)

No New IGA/Rs

AMENDMENTS TO EXISTING REVENUE CONTRACTS

Contractor	Contract Amendment Term	Contract Type	Description of Services	Amendment Amount, Contract Total	Responsible Administrator, Funding Source
State of Oregon, Department of Education	7/9/13 through 6/30/2015	Intergovernmental Agreement IGA/R 59939 Amendment 1	Columbia Regional Program: Additional services added to the scope of work, and additional funding added to provide for those services.	\$569,008 \$18,701,900	H. Adair Fund 205 Grant G1341

LIMITED SCOPE REAL PROPERTY REVENUE AGREEMENTS AND AMENDMENTS

No Limited Scope Real Property Revenue Agreements or Amendments

N. Sullivan

Other Items Requiring Board Action

The Superintendent RECOMMENDS adoption of the following item:

Number 4871

RESOLUTION No. 4871

Resolution to Adopt District Education Specifications for Comprehensive High Schools

RECITALS

- A. The May 2012 update to the PPS Long Range Facility Plan identified the development of District-wide Education Specifications (Ed Specs) for all District schools as a future step.
- B. Development of Ed Specs for the District is occurring in two phases. The first phase engaged in a process to envision the future of educational facilities in PPS. This process was completed during the winter and spring of 2013 and is summarized in the Educational Facilities Vision adopted by Resolution No. 4800.
- C. The Vision document articulates a vision for the future of District school buildings and key themes that emerged during community conversations on the topic. The second phase of the project is developing educational standards and specifications (Ed Specs) for all District school buildings by school configuration (high school, middle school, Pre K-8 and Pre-K 5).
- D. District-wide Ed Specs are a set of facilities guidelines that establish the ways school buildings support programs and curriculum, and establish baseline facility standards across the District. As a specific school site approaches significant modernization, the District-wide Ed Specs are tailored through a master planning process to suit the individual school, program and community through staff, student and community engagement with design professionals. To the extent feasible, the Ed Specs will also inform regularly occurring program changes and space planning considerations in schools not undergoing full modernization.
- E. In May 2013, the Ed Spec project team began a series of focus group conversations with PPS high school teachers and administrators interested in how building design affects teaching and learning to provide input on what physical elements schools of the future should have to provide 21st century education. High school teachers participating in the highly successful ModLE learning symposium in February 2012 were invited to take part in the three focus group meetings for teachers on comprehensive high schools. Teachers were also invited by their principals and colleagues to be part of the conversations. Leadership from the Office of Schools and District Operations provided additional feedback on the initial drafts of the comprehensive high school area program and Ed Specs.
- F. The Comprehensive High School Ed Specs strive to balance the aspirations of the PPS Education Facilities Vision, the design and program principles expressed in the high school Ed Spec focus group meetings, capital budget, building and site constraints, and program variations by providing some of preferred and optional spaces that individual schools can choose from during master planning to fulfill the specific programmatic needs of each high school.
- G. The Board of Education affirms the need for each comprehensive high school to provide career preparation and technical education opportunities for all its students. Success of career learning opportunities in comprehensive high schools benefit from a strong program foundation resourced by insights into future career trends, student interest, availability of certified staff, and sufficient space and equipment related to the career related learning experience each school intends to offer. Providing career-related learning spaces identified through individual school schematic design processes that are supported by spaces such as maker spaces and labs appropriate to each high school program are an essential element of fully modernizing Portland Public Schools portfolio of comprehensive high schools.
- H. The Superintendent recommends adoption of the Comprehensive High School Education Specifications by the Board of Education.

RESOLUTION

1. The Board affirms the design principles and area program allocation process of the Ed Spec as well as the input received from teachers and administrators to inform the development of the Comprehensive High School Ed Spec.
2. The Board adopts the Comprehensive High School Education Specifications dated January 27, 2014, provided as Attachment A to this Resolution as amended by Attachment 2 to the Superintendent's recommendation dated February 3, 2014.

Attachment A: Comprehensive High School Education Specifications dated January 27, 2014.

C. Sylvester / J. Owens