

Welcome.

>> How are you?

>> How are you, Josh?

>> Laura, we have Fred here.

We're going to hope Lori will join.

The first item I want to introduce you to Josh Wallak deputy chancellor for strategic initiatives overseeing the pre kindergarten procurement efforts as you know and see from the package.

You're going to be asked to approve a lot pre kindergarten programs.

Some new, some existing, converting to full day.

And we'll be talking about the next week, but we'll talk about them today.

The one thing I'll say before Josh talks about them from a program perspective and the things they've been doing to make this program a success is you have you a laundry list of vendors and we're finishing a lot what is a tremendous effort on my staff's part to do background checks on all these vendors.

I've actually -- we've enlisted the help to help my group that does background checks to vet all of these vendors and if there are issues we'll put those in front of the panel.

It's possible if you get pulled at the last minute if we find significant adverse information that we don't think we can move forward with.

The expect all or most of the vendors to be in front of you on Thursday.

I'm hopeful they can get through or background screen or enough that we'll put them in front of you.

That's our side of it.

We do be checks after Josh's group as seen these programs pass in terms of scoring as worth y.

Before I say anymore I should turn to Josh.

>> I want to echo what David said.

There's a been an incredible amount of work from the division of contracts and procurement.

Is that right?

>> That's correct.

>> From DCP and their team.

All her folks have been so helpful in getting this done and it's an enormous amount of work.

Universal pre kindergarten at the center of what he wanted to accomplish during his time as mayor and charged us with making that vision a reality and so since he took office in early January, we have been running as fast as we can to try to stand up a system that can accommodate close to 53,000 four-year-olds in high quality pre

kindergarten beginning this fall.

The following year we'll be able to offer it to any four-year-old that wants that opportunity.

Estimating about 73,000.

This is the first part of -- it's actually not -- it's one important part of that effort.

The first part was asking district schools if they could accommodate additional or new sections of prekindergarten, the chancellor asked principals to volunteer for that and we saw an incredibly large response that allowed us to add thousands of seats.

But one of the strengths of New York City system is that we have a very diverse system.

That's distributed among hundreds of high-quality providers around day care centers, head start, small schools, museums, other community -- social service agencies that provide high quality programs.

The chancellor put out a call and asked them to step up.

What you see here today is the first batch of those.

Over 200 contracts for some -- some of which are with existing providers that are heeding the call to expand.

All of them went through a very rigorous process that's laid out by DCP and office of early childhood education to make sure that they are delivering high quality curriculum with instructors that are well-trained and supported with a vision for how to get children ready for kindergarten and prepared to succeed in kindergarten and beyond.

And that process includes not only the thorough background check but a site visit that includes educators and operational people and then a very detailed written proposal that lays out the educational vision and the child development vision really for that program as a whole. So these are the ones that made that cut.

And we're proud to put them forward.

And think they're going to really give reality to that vision that the mayor laid out a year and a half ago.

That's my programmatic statement.

I'll be happy to take any questions.

>> (Off mic)

>> Less than three months.

>> (Off mic)

>> Thanks.

>> Just astounding.

Thank you for your kind words about my team.

>> Thanks very much.

It is a team effort as always.

>> I have a question.

For the ones on the list and some say to be determined, and I noticed some I'm familiar with and the ones that may be take head start fund

or also funding for other streams, are those CBOs having a problem signing on because they can't -- they have to accept funds that help target low-income students and then can't be --
>> I think you froze up there.

>> -- open to general --

>> Your second question broke up.

Let me answer the first and then if it's okay, I'll ask you to go back to the second question because you broke up there.

So it's hard to hear.

The initial posting of the, with the list of vendors, we didn't have dollar amounts and actually there were some substitutes, there were a few vendors that have since been added and taken off the list.

So you will ultimately have -- provides the number of students and dollar amounts for every one of the vendors.

You will get a comprehensive list.

It was just -- usually I like to go to the panel for the even the committee meetings with a completed RA at least in draft and definite dollar amount and those things.

This is one of those cases where we feel that it is better to get a vendor on the list at the lastest minute so we can accommodate as many children as possible with high quality programs, not at all compromising on the standards of the program, than to wait until we have everything cleaned up and ready for panel.

you will get a list of ought vendors with the dollar amounts because we have that.

But certainly in advance of the panel meeting.

And so there won't be any uncertainty in that regard.

The second question was?

>> I was wondering for some of them, is the problem or is -- is there a problem with certain --

>> I think I understand the question.

You're freezing again.

Let me try.

>> Can you hear me?

>> Yeah.

I know you're sort of flickering in and out too.

That's okay.

Go ahead.

>> I'll try.

So you're right that some of the community based early childhood centers also get money from our funding streams.
other funding streams.

There are essentially two cases I can describe to you.

One is that if they are programs that are part of the early learn system through the administration for children services, then those

programs get UPK funding and funding from head start and typically from child care development block as well.

Those programs don't have a problem.

We've integrated them completely into the UPK system.

We're not typically doing -- we're not actually contracting with them here.

They're contracted through the administration for children's services, but as part of our program, we're giving them increased professional development and support and we're also increasing the salaries of their certified lead teacher.

Even though they're contracted through ACS they're still part of our world.

If they did opt to contract with us, then what they would do is they would have signed up for a new classroom.

And so they would get separate UPK dollars and wouldn't come into conflict with the head start dollars they got.

Those are the two cases that are possible.

Make sense?

>> Okay.

And so the first case is they're just operating under different funding streams but they will sort of -- and -- are they open to all students?

Or are they -- their admission is limited to I guess targeting low-income students or whatever the federal money is provided for?

>> Yes.

So if they are part of that ACS system receiving head start or child care dollars then there are income eligibility requirements there.

We're going to work very closely with ACS and human resource administration to make it as easy for families as possible to access them.

The good news is that typically those programs charge the sliding scale fee and so this year the mayor decided and chancellor decided to make the six hours and 20 minutes of the UPK day free for all families.

So that's a difference in those programs.

You're right to say that those particular slots that are through ACS do have eligibility requirements.

About 12,000 out of 54,000 that we're going to be operating this year

>> They won't actually have some seats allotted for the federal funds and other seats open through UPK for the DOE/UPK program, just continue on --

>> They're going to continue their program with the additional support from us.

They're going to get through this program additional training, additional professional development.

through ACS we're going to use some state dollars to increase the salary levels for some of those certified teachers, include them in

our dwofl development sessions and going to help them increase -- improve their assessments.
We're kind of bringing them into the system and I think over the next couple years, we're going to figure out how to -- we're going to work with ACS to figure out ways to bring those systems closer together. That's the goal.

>> Thank you.

>> We started with item eight.
We're now -- if there are no additional questions --
>> I do have a question.

>> How many responses did we get and what are we down to now?

>> 367 I recall was the responses to the RFP.

>> Now we're down to 215
>> Those are new.

>> Right.
367 might have been the number of sites.
I think there was a smaller number of vendors that proposed.
What you're seeing is the number of vendors proposed in the 215.
I think it's --
>> We would be comparing apples and oranges.

>> Yeah.
Yeah.
Might actually be --
>> Which is that we accepted about 60 percent of those that proposed.
Is that sort of what you're --
>> I wanted to understand because especially whatever number that didn't get -- I expected there would probably be some discussion around that.
I wanted to know what the number was originally.
Can share the disqualifiers in terms of proposals?

>> Essentially what the teams looked at was the -- whether the program had a vision for the program and sort of the educational infrastructure that was -- that matched the state standards for prekindergarten that we believe was developmentally appropriate and had the elements needed to prepare kids for success in kindergarten. We also looked at the space to ensure that was -- that they had sufficient space and space that we thought could get a license to operate before September of 2014.
So in some cases that was a reason for disqualification.
And in some cases I think there was a lack of clarity about who would be available to teach those classes ask whether they have the appropriate qualifications.

But basically came down to quality.

We were trying to follow the mayor's vision, we were going to do a rapid expansion but hold ourselves accountable for very high quality programming.

So traditionally DOE has accepted about 60 percent of those that apply, and we essentially are holding the same percentage constant here even though we're trying to go really fast

>> I could answer that, Fred, that because we received so many prekindergarten proposals and we are managing obviously multiple evaluation committees, selection committees, we had a very well evolved rubric we've used for years, it's been modified to I would say a modest extent year to year, but what it does is it articulates with a fair degree of specificity what a different score means. In order for a vendor to qualify, they need to get a score of 80 or more to possibly get a program.

Above that we make sure we select the best program if there isn't as much need in app community.

But fundamentally that 80 is a baseline score and that's a fairly well-defined 80 because the evaluation committees work with this rubric that tells them for the different components for site visit what to look for and what gets scored at a different level.

So it's a pretty well standardized set of procedures that they use in scoring rubric for evaluating these proposals on a city-wide basis.

And Josh's office had a training for all of the people doing the evaluations.

It's a full-day training the people go through before they do the scoring which they actually walk through the rubric and talk about doing the evaluation to make sure we're actually consistent and adhering to these standards on a city-wide basis.

>> Okay.

>> (Off mic)

>> Okay.

>> Very good.

>> I'm getting the information.

>> Now we'll go back to item one and the rest of the items on the agenda.

Thank you, Josh.

So the first item is with school professionals.

This is a six-month extension of a contract that's been in place for some time.

It was originally competitively awarded contract.

These are consultants that are used in schools, networks, and central offices.

And they don't assume teaching positions or supervisory roles administered by school staff.

They're all temporary employees.

So it's a six-month exception.

-month exception.

Reason why we needed to extend this contract, was because the vendors had to deal with the -- at the time was a significant uncertainty around the new federal healthcare law and how it would be rolled out and what those requirements would be so they were struggling and we were struggling with how to deal with that and of course vendors don't want to assume too much risk and we wanted still to get good prices and if there's two of risk involved we won't get good prices.

Took us some time to grapple with that.

The second item -- I'm going to do my usual thing and go quickly.

Stop me with questions when you have any.

The second item is with transportation.

This is another -- I hoped we wouldn't have to do another one but an assignment of contract [from amboy which went bankrupt to Hoyt transportation assigned by the bankruptcy court.

There were problems getting the contract executed and signed so we can get it registered because we had no other way to continue to contract with them other than to declare an emergency.

So I didn't expect you you to have to see these against.

It's an emergency assignment to contract to continue bus services and that's of course the contract that has EPP provisions in it.

The next is actually associated with a pre kindergarten initiative.

As I mentioned in, we are conducting an extraordinary number of background checks on the prekindergarten vendors in a very short period of time.

Actually we were doing over the month more background checks than my office would typically process over the course of a year and just don't have trained staff to do that.

So we went out to four different firms to look that are really investigatory firms to get help with the background check process.

Any issues that they find are brought to my staff, we're reviewing what they're doing so we review summary documents they prepare for us, but Thatcher and associates on our behalf is able to look at list, the federal system for award management, west law, famous system, Lexus, nexus and I'll stop there with the list of about a dozen in total sources they go through that my office would normally go through in the context of conducting a background check.

They're doing it for us.

If they come up with questionable information that's still going to my office to vet and make determinations on and we'll bring them to you if we see significant adverse information.

This was just one of the things we needed to do to handle the enormous push of vendors coming through for pre kindergarten services.

We did that on a negotiated service basis because we didn't have time for an RFP.

Technically we're calling it a negotiated service which often is thought of as a no big deal at that accurate but we considered four different vendors and the prices from four different vendors, just

didn't have time to go through the full advertising process and all of the wrap around stuff you do if you do a formal RFP.

The next item is you'll recall the last panel meeting we had an item that had 62 vendors for pre kindergarten services that was money that came through in the fall at a very late date and we started.

These vendors have been in place and providing services since January. There were seven of them that we just had some things that needed to be completed basically background checks.

That's why they didn't make it to the last panel meeting for vote.

They're on for this meeting and pre kindergarten and that's I think all that needs to be said on that.

They're in place and doing fine.

The next one every once in a while we need to contract for physical education facilities.

This one is Leeman college serving a few high schools in the Bronx. That's it.

It's providing -- and actually it's more than just felts in this case. They're also providing services.

So in this case they're providing support services in physical education for these students as well.

The next one is united way.

Did you want to talk about this at all Kathleen?

services in physical education for these students as well.

The next one is united way.

Did you want to talk about this at all Kathleen?

>> (Off mic)

>> There a microphone that can reach her?

>> I tried to get it -- do you want to take my seat for this?

>> That's all right.

>> Sorry?

>> Could you talk a little louder?

>> She's going to come down and take my seat.

Because there's a microphone in front of me.

And I'll yell.

Or not.

>> This is state money, and the focus of this money is on attendance and trying to support schools that had difficulty either high attendance rate or need supports.

We found any kind of work we do in this area that is a tremendous impact generally.

This money will go to the united way.

The united way will do a competitive process and will select 42CB0s so work with schools to create a community school effort.

It will have to focus on attendance, but it will also focus on many other things.

We will select the schools because we will look for schools that need this kind of help.

And then probably in August we will have a marriage process of some sort to match the CBOs with the schools.

We'll probably have a fair for the schools to come and make decisions and selections.

The chancellor is adamant that the schools get the principals work with their school communities at the school leadership teams review the applications and are part of it and support offive because that's such an important component of community schools.

As I say, we're excited about this.

And it means that by October we will have hopefully 42 community schools in play.

I think you have to --

>> Providing these services to us for several years now.

This is a successor to a previous contract engagement we've had with them for a while but it's worked.

This one comes with some improvements

>> Actually, they have been doing this -- doing work with our schools for many, many years.

It's a terrific organization.

I'm sure some of you know it.

And what they used to do is work with ninth graders on attendance.

The theory that that's the first grade in high school, and if you could get young people to have really serious and good attendance habits in the ninth grade they might carry over.

So that work will either continue under other grants or it might not continue.

But this work will of course have a broader spectrum, I think, in terms of trying to engage the entire school community in the efforts that will take place.

Any questions on that?

>> Well, this isn't the formal community school initiative, this is just to start creating community school-like services in select schools?

This isn't the actual program to create the --

>> It's not the Cincinnati model necessarily.

But it will look somewhat like it, because the CBO will have someone assigned to that school who will be in charge of focusing the services and working with the community and working with the parents.

So it's sort of -- I always see a first year of any contract as an experiment in terms of how it's working.

And of course, we will be working very closely with the united fund to monitor all of these CBOs to see how things are going and to see what lessons we can learn from them.

>> Thank you.

I'm going to give you your seat back and this bright light.

>> Yeah.

>> Okay.

That was the united way.

We're on item seven, which is the labor support unit consultants. We this as an RFP although it's somewhat unusual, this is -- we're actually hiring a team of individuals that provide assistance to principals and APs to evaluate and assist with the discipline process with poorly performing pedagogs.

So this was -- this is an open ended RFP which means that we might come to you like we do with multiple task award contract with additional proposals and vendors if there are other qualified providers that come along to us.

And they're paid a base rate.

It's a purely qualitative evaluation of the vendors that come in.

The department pays what it pays for these individuals.

The next item is eight.

We talked about eight item.

That's the prekindergarten item.

We're up to nine.

Chrome books.

This is a straight bid.

We got nine bids and the low bidder qualified so they will be the awardee for this contract.

These are really devices, they're relatively inexpensive and they're used for web access.

The data and stuff doesn't reside on them so they're different from a PC, which we have a contract for PCs that's basically with Lenovo and these are coming in at a very aggressive fully loaded price with three-year warranty and accidental damage --

>> (Off mic)

>> These are very popular and that's why the dollars are high, the estimate is reflective of what we've seen as a lot of interest in purchasing them.

I think because they do give access to the web at relatively low cost.

But again, we did this as a bid.

If schools move on to something else as a prefer platform the amount to spend on this contract will drop like a rock.

>> Is the amount of the purchase or the projected I guess interest, is that related to the online testing?

Because the -- because they're limited -- is that in anticipation of online testing?

>> No.

It's really just to reflection of demand.

I think that what you see is a lot of schools want to make sure all of their students have access to the web, and they don't want to spend a

lot of money buying fancy PCs.

They want low cost access to the web and this is low cost access to the web.

That's why people buy chrome books, to get inexpensive access to the web and fast service.

So I think they're popular for that reason.

>> Did we see this before sometime in the past?

>> You saw it posted I think about three or four months ago we posted it and we withdrew it because there was some external discussion about whether the chancellor wanted these available in the schools and ultimately we decided that we did.

Yes, the procurement was conducted some time ago.

>> What's the process for these?

How does the school get access?

>> These chrome books will go like most or commodities in the shop DOE portal.

It's just -- if you can imagine an Amazon.com-like website that schools see.

They go into that website, they find these devices lists side by side with other PCs and apple Apple devices and in this particular case if they clicked on the chrome book because that's what they want, they would automatically -- it would be punching out an order to CDW.

They don't necessarily care, they can see who the vendor is, but most schools are getting it because they're going in and want a chrome book and that's -- and they're looking at the price of the chrome book next to the other devices and this is what they will see.

And they buy a lot of these, we'll see the spending of the estimate or more probably -- if some new technology comes along that's cheaper or better they will go buy something else.

In the area stuff like that that would be my job is getting the best possible prices and quality I can for the schools and leave it to the principals to decide what technology they want to buy.

>> Is there a cap for the schools to order let's say if -- the administration wants to order 20.

With they order 500?

>> Their cap would be their budget.

>> Okay.

>> Any other questions on itemnine?

Okay.

So the next one is moving services.

I'll say this is one that the estimate might be a little bit higher than we'll go because it reflects past summer moves and there are less

moves and changes the number might come down.

Most of this money is spent during the year.

During the summer.

It can be used to some extent during the winter.

But we have moving companies available to us so that when there are changes in school locations, we can move schools.

It's moving furniture, moving books, moving all the stuff that goes inside a school building that's between -- that isn't the wall or between the walls.

We did -- this is a bid.

Sometimes things work out lovely like with the chrome books where we get nine bids and we're able to award to the low bidder.

Sometimes it doesn't work out that way.

In this particular case as you can see, there were several of the low bidders in different categories that for various reasons didn't pass scrutiny.

Some of them you saw didn't pass because when we looked at their prices they didn't cover prevailing wages.

In another instance when we look at their bids by category they appeared to be uneven and that in and of itself isn't necessarily a problem, but in specific categories, their pricing was below prevailing wage and that's a problem to us so we adapt award them.

You could see the RA articulates why we bypassed some of the low bidders, but I think it's just one of those cases that just reflects the due diligence that goes 52 procurement decisions and the care we place on making sure the vendors that we're awarding contracts will comply and be able to perform.

Any questions on that?

The next item is actually a third RA of its type.

This actually adds contractors that will supplement those who are awarded una prior RFP for special education related services.

More of these tertiary vendors.

Gives us a greater pool of vendors able to provide these special ed services.

The next contract may be one of the most or the most confusing contract I'll ever put in front of you.

I'll do my best to explain it to you.

It's for insurance.

So I think the best way to understand it is if I describe to you the responsibilities of sort of all the different places.

We have this blanket contract in place and technically what we're putting in front of you is a change to the Willis contract but it's not a change to the contract that we didn't anticipate, it's a change to the Willis contract that always knew would come that we did last year and the year before but we have to handle it as a change because it changes the vendors that will be neat them.

Willis acts as our insurance broker, they create coverage specifications, solicit proposals from insurance carriers each year and that's what this reflects this year's process.

They issue ID cards and certificates of insurance and review trends

and guidance of coverage.

Willis is responsible and law prescribes insurance has to be done this way.

Lawyers can explain this.

But we have an insurance carrier which is one of the two reasons why this is brought to you, to approve the change to the Willis contract that really just extends the using of the same carrier we've used before.

They are responsible for underwriting risk, insurance -- they issue the insurance policy, meeting statutory requirements, and are responsible for the payment of claims.

So the insurance carrier is Greenwich insurance company.

We're modifying the contract to extend the engagement of Greenwich.

And third is the third -- is the -- Greenwich is -- the third is the third-party administrator and they do the day to day handling of claims.

Obtain claim information, determine claim amounts, and they process payments.

The RA explains the process that Willis goes through on our behalf in soliciting proposers that could potentially provide the services of the third party administrator and of the insurance carrier and it describes the process.

I think they solicited seven vendors and it describes the level of competition or lack thereof in the first case for them.

>> Does the DOE vet these vendors once they've been identified by Willis?

Or Willis is responsible --

>> Willis acts on our behalf and provide information to us and we ultimately have to approve this.

We vet the Willis proposals.

This is getting on tail end of the process.

Last year I remember, for example, the third-party administrator, I know the third party administrator I believe also that the Greenwich changed, both the carrier and third party administrator changed so we were fairly deeply involved in the due diligence process with women list and making sure we were comfortable with the decisions they made.

This year there are continuations on contracts that work.

They solicited other proposals and suffice to say we're happy with where we were.

They didn't get anything better or significantly different.

So there's not as much involved this year.

>> I have a question.

I really don't understand this.

The insurance that you're talking about all the different levels, is it insurance for the DOE by dealing with the insurance companies that cover the busses?

>> I'm sorry I left that part out.

It's all busses.

And in fact some of the new contracts that we have put the insurance on the bus companies.

So it's really the legacy of the older contracts that we have that still have the insurance on the -- that's on do DOE through this program that we have where we're providing the coverage and that's what this is for.

It's just about busses, yeah.

And we're required to do that privately.

We can't insure our own busses.

Left that out.

>> (Off mic)

>> If I understood this better I'd explain it better.

Through all the time we've spent on that, and it's been a lot.

So I guess I'll talk about item 13 and 26 together.

The department made a decision, we actually -- as you probably know we conducted a bid that we have not yet acted on for summer bussing services, just July and August, that was going to start this July. We've not made an award against that contract.

And there is an interagency working group that's reviewing the impact of removing the employee protection provisions from the transportation contracts, there's a lot of discussion about how we're going to do that.

We made a decision not to move forward with that contract at least for the summer.

While we review options.

These contracts, 13 and 26, in short form I would say extend arrangements that we have currently to the best that we can to cover this summer while we sort out options for what we're going to in the future.

If you would like, I can go into more detail.

In sum and substance that's what those two items are.

Okay.

I know it's a long list of items today.

I'm sorry, but it's going to start going quicker because we're up to the multiple task award part of the process.

Most of these will go a little bit faster.

The next one is the fifth RA for professional development for school leaders, adding vendors as options for that multiple task award contract.

The next one is also just additional vendors.

In this case the third RA, third set of additional vendors, in this case just one additional vendor that would provide professional development services in arts, education, the next one I won't move as quickly on because this is actually a new multiple task award contract.

For that reason alone at least it would require some degree of discussion and I guess the other thing I should say is this particular one is for title one non-public school supplementary instructional

services.

These services are ultimately under the responsibility of the bureau of non-public schools which reports up to deputy chancellor Grimm. We oversee those programs.

We did this as a multiple task award contract so we would have multiple vendors available as we do with other multiple task award contracts available to us so that we could select vendors that best suit the schools or groups of schools that we're attempting to serve with these title I services.

A bit unique because the services are going to be in the non-public schools and a lot of multiple task award contracts you hear me say primarily schools sometimes central offices.

In this case it is the central office that runs the utility we have, multiple task water contract to decide which vendor is going to go get into the schools.

Although the non-public schools or a group from within that were actually represented with the evaluation committee embedding the proposals that were submitted in response to this multiple task award contract.

>> (Off mic).

>> I guess the other thing I should volunteer, I know Laurie, you received questions I saw and I don't want to ignore them.

So I'm going to address some of what you've seen.

I'm not going to do a point by point today.

If you have any questions I'll address them afterward or whatever.

But I know there was some questions about -- a lot has been made about the bid opening was delayed.

This isn't a bid.

This is a multiple task award contract and one of the reasons we do multiple task award contracts is we actually want to get as many vendors as we can as options for schools.

But still vet them and make sure they meet standards.

In this particular case yes we had a due date for submission of proposals.

But in the context of any multiple task award contract, even if we hadn't delayed the due date we still would have considered those proposals.

We just would have considered them after the proposals that had come in already.

In this particular case, we made a last minute decision, it was literally last minute decision to delay the receipt of proposals because we had a terrible snowstorm that day and the last thing I want to happen is that we have limited options for schools because of a snowstorm.

However, having said all of that, all of the five vendors who were recommended for award submitted on time proposals.

One of them submitted a supplement to their proposal the next day or a day after.

It was late.

So it was within the extended time.

But they still submitted a proposal.

They still would have been considered.

It wouldn't have made a difference.

I'm astounded sometimes the things people think suggest that there's some impropriety.

This one is like insane.

There are other issues -- the other thing I'll say is there are issues with catapult and various places that will be discussed in the RA when we have a fully vetted RA.

The flip side is catapult has provided quality services in our schools for a while.

The selection committee looked at them very carefully.

We've looked at the matters in New Jersey and Michigan and we just don't think there are issues that suggest that -- that rise to a level we wouldn't feel comfortable awarding a contract.

I didn't want to ignore those issues.

Any other questions on that?

So the next is item 17, so this is a contract with Kune, a government to government contract.

This was not a competitively awarded contract although if we do want to continue services beyond the term of this, continue months, basically this year through next summer to students can get whatever degrees, certifications they're seeking, we would do competitively, but we worked on an agreement with them in the immediate term and this is providing professional development services for providers both in our schools and in some of the community based early childhood centers so that we get the -- so we can get some professional development and degree programs for the prekindergarten teachers.

So that's what that initiative is.

I should have had Josh talk about it, but whatever.

The next two items, the first one with American Express and next one with key measure chanted, 18 and 19, are contracts -- we're purchasing through other government agency contracts, we're just buying credit card services so we can process American Express card payments and process Visa payments for various places around the department that accept credit cards.

It's the processing fees.

Any merchant pays an amount to American Express or visa when they accept the cards.

That's what this is for.

That's those two items.

We're up to Item 20.

So item 20 is a city council item.

I'm going to move through them if you want to ask questions about them, I'll go back.

The next one is a grant.

And the next couple of items, next three, are listing applications.

Listing applications you'll remember, we're buying licensed and

copyrighted materials or access to museums or cultural institutions.
So the first is Rosetta stone.

Sun burst digital.

Listing applications, the reason we do them that way is because they're sold only by the publisher.

There's no way of doing a competitive procurement for those services. And last item we already talked about with item 13 I told you this was one of those -- another set of the bus contracts that we did to cover this summer.

So that's --

>> I have a question on that.

>> Item 22, the professional development workshops for teachers, under discussion we're it talks about -- it refers to also offer workshops in the school community, so that means people other than teachers are going to get --

>> Sometimes they do -- it's parent engagement. which one are we talking about?

>> 22.

>> 22?

>> Yeah.

>> So I can give you a sense.

So it's a -- 16 schools.

The PD and peer mentoring is for teacher and teacher effectiveness, special ed strategies,.

The other part is parent workshops.

They do with dealing with anxiety.

Understanding core curriculum standards and it's up to 35 participants.

>> Do other departments work with you guys on these contracts and review them?

This is like a rhetorical question, but I'm a certified teacher and I'm just wondering if there's like an academic lens to this contract be awarded and it's not just monetary reasons.

>> I want to -- I'm trying think of how to answer this.

At a high level with the grants, somebody is offering money.

It's not our money.

Whatever the grantor is, and we identify them.

In this case it's state education department.

So they put out a process to evaluate proposals for grants.

They're awarding money and giving us money with the specification that it's for this set of services, and, by the way, this is the vendor.

So our choice -- got it

>> Just to finish the story for everyone, our choice is to take the money and have the program or not.

There may be instances -- we review things enough to be sure that we want it.

If somebody gave us money to do something that we didn't approve of, didn't think we should be doing, we would just not take the money.

But in economics terms, if it's a good-good, we take it.

Okay.

So we only need to decide how we divide up the agenda and if there are any things that -- comments from the committee.

I'll back up here.

>> Seems natural to me that maybe the pre K stuff gets its own thing.

>> I think actually Josh and I talked about it.

I think that the intent is that Josh would make a presentation probably to the panel and the public at the panel meeting on prekindergarten.

It might not even be in the procurement section.

There will certainly be at least a suggestion of pre K and if you like we can vote on that item separately.

>> That makes sense.

>> Okay.

>> Multiple task awards you could probably put as one section.

>> (Off mic)

>> Multiple task award contract.

>> Do you want to do all of them together?

>> I'm okay with that.

Anybody have any problem with putting the --

>> Let's do it.

>> There was a listing application.

>> There were a few listing applications actually.

Do you want to put -- I don't want to railroad anybody.

To me the listing applications, grants and multiple task award contracts tend to be the least controversial although -- no confusion, I mean, there may be questions on the non-public school one because that, you know, people look at.

So maybe if you want to put all of the sort of very, very easy together and --

>> (Off mic).

>> And listing applications.

>> How many is that total in that group?

>> I don't know.
I haven't counted.

>> (Off mic).

>> Thank you.
They start on item -- first of the multiple task award contracts is 14.
So it would be 14, 15, 16 if we included the non-publics.
That's it.
And then -- yeah.

>> (Off mic).

>> And put the listing apps with them and the -- do you want to put the government purchases with them too, the government -- the Kune item -- do you want to put the Kune with the pre K?
I don't know how many votes you want to have.
Through all the dividing up at the end of the day panel members can decide that they want to vote on single items anyway, right?
Just because we're lumping items together doesn't mean it's an all or nothing.
Not the U.S.
congress, right?
You get to vote on this regardless.

>> I don't want to make the group so large with seven or eight of them -- I think with the MTACS, listing applications -- I was trying to figure out what the number is.
Five or six, fine.

>> (Off mic).

>> Great.

>> (Off mic).

>> Do you want to just -- just guidance?
Other things you want to vote on individually other than the pre K?

>> (Off mic).

>> We're usually two days ahead.
We've got a week this time, yeah.
So that's fine.

>> You said that Josh is going to present --

>> On pre K.
Yes.

>> Okay.

>> And there's three items on pre K.

>> When I say he's going to present, I think his focus will be on the award of prekindergarten programs 215, big RA, that laundry list. The one that's just seven more vendors from January, I mean, frankly, I'll probably just explain that.

If anybody asks a question about it, I don't even know if Josh would remember it.

It was done before he even got here.

The Kune initiative I know he's familiar with.

Whether he includes that in his presentation or not, I don't know.

You can certainly ask him any questions about it at the panel meeting.

He's intimately familiar with that program as I am.

We've both within involved with Kune.

If pe --

>> I forgot to ask the hot topic question.

Doesn't seem any of these are charter schools, right?

>> Correct.

We did -- to be clear -- there are two subsequent solicitations for prekindergarten.

One was exclusively for charters and there's another one that basically seeks additional providers that didn't submit proposals the first time around.

Gives them another bite at the apple.

I'm not sure whether or when the charters go to the panel, how that works.

That's for the lawyers.

What I'll characterize the second group of prekindergartens and any that might not have made it through this pass that might still would come to the panel either in June or July.

>> Thank you.

>> Probably July.

>> So there will be -- I'm assuming there will be RFPs for --

>> So not RFP.

I'm streaming here so I have to be a little bit technical.

We did an additional solicitation for proposals which would come to you as negotiate services because we didn't have time to run a full blown RFP process.

Whatever vendors we bring forward then would still have been vetted using the same evaluation criteria and we will have vetted through background checks just like any of the other pre k's, just the process

won't have fulfilled all the requirements that we have to call it a RFP.

So there will be -- so, Fred to, answer, there will be more prekindergartens coming to the panel in June, I expect, and certainly by July for services starting in September.

No question about it.

There will be more charters.

And I'm not sure charters go to the panel, but I think they actually do, and then certainly the more non-charters and then we'll do another RFP next year because we do RFPs each year for prekindergarten to fill in where we still have gaps in services.

Everybody good?

>> Thanks.

>> Thank you.
Okay.

>> Thank you.

>> Thank you.

>> Bye, Laura.

>> Bye, enjoy the week.

>> Thank you.
You too.