INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 625
Saint Paul, Minnesota
MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION

December 17, 2019

I. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 6:15 p.m.

II. ROLL CALL

Present: Ms. Ellis, Ms. Foster, Mr. Brodrick, Ms. Xiong, Ms. Vanderwert, Mr. Schumacher, Mr. Marchese, Superintendent Gothard, Mr. Long, General Counsel, and Ms. Dahlke, Assistant Clerk

III. APPROVAL OF THE ORDER OF THE MAIN AGENDA

MOTION: Ms. Ellis moved approval of the Order of the Main Agenda with one change – to move Old Business – Policy Update and Old Business – Security and Emergency Management Vision SY20 and Beyond and Agreement with City of St. Paul Police Department for Shared Costs of School Resource Officers (SROs) to follow the Committee Reports. The motion was seconded by Mr. Schumacher.

The motion was approved with the following roll call vote:

Ms. Ellis	Yes
Ms. Foster	Yes
Mr. Brodrick	Yes
Ms. Xiong	Yes
Ms. Vanderwert	Yes
Mr. Schumacher	Yes
Mr. Marchese	Yes

IV. RECOGNITIONS

BF 31859 Acknowledgement of Good Work Provided by Outstanding District Employees and Departments

Yasmin Muridi, a bilingual family liaison at Four Seasons A+ Elementary, has been named the 2019-20 Education Minnesota Education Support Professional (ESP) of the Year. “ESPs are often the first people that interact with our students each day and the last ones to say goodbye,” said Education Minnesota Vice President Bernie Burnham. “But Yasmin not only interacts with our students to make them feel welcome in her school, she makes sure their families feel like part of the school community. Yasmin’s work with the students and families of Four Seasons has a direct effect on their educational and personal success.”

As the new Minnesota ESP of the Year, Muridi will receive a new Apple iPad and a $1,000 honorarium. She will also be nominated for the National Education Association’s ESP of the Year and will receive an all-expenses paid trip to New Orleans for the awards ceremony in March.

David McGill, science specialist at Capitol Hill Gifted and Talented Magnet, was recently awarded the 2018 Presidential Award for Excellence in Mathematics and Science Teaching. The 2018 awardees were announced on October 15, 2019.

David has been an educator since 1999 and began his career as a gifted and talented instructor. Since 2010, he has been the Elementary Science Specialist at Capitol Hill, and teaches first through fifth grade science and sixth grade STEM. David is the Twin Cities Metropolitan District Director for the Minnesota Science Teachers Association (MnSTA). He was a three-year fellow with Engineering to Transform the Education of Analysis, Measurement, and Science (EngrTEAMS). He coauthored a curriculum unit on fourth grade engineering standards. He is an active member of the Geological Society of Minnesota, the MnSTA, and the National Science Teachers Association.

The Presidential Awards for Excellence in Mathematics and Science Teaching (PAEMST) is the highest recognition that a kindergarten through 12th grade science, technology, engineering, mathematics, and/or computer science teacher may receive for outstanding teaching in the United States. Up to 108 teachers are recognized each year.

Presidential Awardees receive a certificate signed by the President of the United States; a trip to Washington D.C. to attend a series of recognition events and professional development opportunities; and a $10,000 award from the National Science Foundation.

Board members also recognized **Director Mary Vanderwert** and **Director Jon Schumacher**, as this meeting was their final meeting as members of the Board. Director Foster thanked Director Vanderwert for her work in the District of true commitment and engagement in SPPS and championing our youngest learners and challenging the District to think about that differently and authentically to ensure our youngest learners are prepared for community and life. She also acknowledged the work in the superintendent search, referendum, reflective practice and 3K steering committee. Director Vanderwert noted that it has been an honor to serve. Chair Ellis noted Jon Schumacher as a leader, former board chair, former treasurer, colleague, and friend. She recalled talking with him at the beginning of their term in working hard for students, even when the work is hard, especially the superintendent search. There also need to be moments to find joy, because there is joy in doing good work for kids. In every way, he has been networking throughout this entire District, and that we all lead together for our students. She thanked him for his guidance, leadership and friendship. Director Schumacher thanked everyone and that it has been an honor to be a part of this Board. Director Marchese also thanked Director Vanderwert and Director Schumacher and recalled their time together on the Board. He is so thankful for their work, their companionship, and friendship in this work. He appreciates their work, friendship and that they made the most of their time in this role. He thanked them for all their work and call them both friends and hope to continue in the years to come.

V. APPROVAL OF THE ORDER OF THE CONSENT AGENDA

MOTION: Ms. Ellis moved approval of the Order of the Consent Agenda item D10 – Approval of the Memorandum of Understanding for the Rent Supplement Pilot Program pulled for separate consideration. The motion was seconded by Mr. Marchese.

The motion was approved with the following roll call vote:

Ms. Ellis	Yes
Ms. Foster	Yes
Mr. Brodrick	Yes
Ms. Xiong	Yes
Ms. Vanderwert	Yes
Mr. Schumacher	Yes
Mr. Marchese	Yes

VI. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

A. Minutes of the Regular Meeting of the Board of Education of November 19, 2019

MOTION: Ms. Ellis moved approval of the Minutes of the Regular Meeting of the Board of Education of November 19, 2019 as published. The motion was seconded by Mr. Schumacher.

The motion was approved with the following roll call vote:

Ms. Ellis	Yes
Ms. Foster	Yes
Mr. Brodrick	Yes
Ms. Xiong	Yes
Ms. Vanderwert	Yes
Mr. Schumacher	Yes
Mr. Marchese	Yes

B. Minutes of the Special Meeting of the Board of Education of December 3, 2019

MOTION: Ms. Ellis moved approval of the Minutes of the Special Meeting of the Board of Education of December 3, 2019 as published. The motion was seconded by Mr. Marchese.

The motion was approved with the following roll call vote:

Ms. Ellis	Yes
Ms. Foster	Yes
Mr. Brodrick	Yes
Ms. Xiong	Yes
Ms. Vanderwert	Yes
Mr. Schumacher	Yes
Mr. Marchese	Yes

C. Minutes of the Special Meeting of the Board of Education of December 10, 2019

MOTION: Ms. Ellis moved approval of the Minutes of the Special Meeting of the Board of Education of December 10, 2019 as published. The motion was seconded by Ms. Foster.

The motion was approved with the following roll call vote:

Ms. Ellis	Yes
Ms. Foster	Yes
Mr. Brodrick	Yes
Ms. Xiong	Yes
Ms. Vanderwert	Yes
Mr. Schumacher	Yes
Mr. Marchese	Yes

VII. COMMITTEE REPORTS

A. Minutes of the Committee of the Board Meeting of December 3, 2019

At the December 3, 2019 Committee of the Board meeting, Superintendent Gothard began the meeting by providing an update on the CollegeBound initiative proposed by Mayor Carter to invest $50 in a college savings fund for every child born in Saint Paul on or after January 1, 2020, as well as a brief statement on the recent notification that the Saint Paul Federation of Educators has petitioned the Bureau of Mediation Services for mediation in their contract negotiations.

Next, the Board learned more about the Security and Emergency Management Vision for School Year 20 and Beyond, including the mission of the department, team of dedication professionals, staffing vision, budget, as well as the 2019 year end review of data and highlights. The school year 20 contract for school resource officers was also reviewed. Student responses to the Minnesota Student Survey were also shared. Questions from board members focused on the racial equity training, details on the Minnesota Student Survey data, student engagement with the survey, and the need for information that is reflective of our student population. Board members also noted appreciation for the big picture vision of the department, that the SRO contract is one

aspect of the department, and the importance of the SROs to be an integrated member of the school-based team comprised of Community Service Liaisons, School Support Liaisons, restorative practices staff, SROs, contract security staff, as well as building leaders. The job requirements of the Community Service Liaison and School Support Liaison were also reviewed. The model, outcomes and evaluation from the pilot currently in place at Como Senior were discussed, as well as plans to replicate this model at other schools. The positive and ongoing relationship between SPPS and SPPD was also shared.

MOTION: Mr. Marchese moved the Board accept the report on the December 3, 2019 Committee of the Board meeting and approve the minutes and recommended motions within that meeting as published. The motion was seconded by Mr. Schumacher.

The motion was approved with the following roll call vote:

Ms. Ellis	Yes
Ms. Foster	Yes
Mr. Brodrick	Yes
Ms. Xiong	Yes
Ms. Vanderwert	Yes
Mr. Schumacher	Yes
Mr. Marchese	Yes

B. Minutes of the Equity Committee Meeting, December 9, 2019

At the December 9, 2019 Equity Committee meeting, Superintendent Gothard began the meeting by welcoming members. He reiterated the charge to bring forth practices and recommendations to the Board of Education and Administration to tackle inequities and result in improved student outcomes. He also shared his experience in speaking at the Minnesota Association of School Administrators, and internal changes in SPPS to disrupt patterns and lead to improved outcomes.

Next, the committee discussed items such as meeting start time, and those voices that may be missing from the committee, as well as the size of the committee in order to be effective and efficient. The process to bring those voices to the committee was also noted. Members also shared that while a member of a community is on the committee, they do not represent the community, but bring a single perspective.

The tri-chairs then shared a quote to ground the committee in their work. Members voiced that there may be difficult conversations, but there is overall agreement to lift every voice given the charge.

Next, the committee reviewed the Courageous Conversations agreements, and Seven Norms of Collaborative work to guide them in their journey. Members then continued discussion on four key questions to the work of the Equity Committee, including their hopes, strengths and skills that will assist in their hopes for the committee, what is necessary to bring their whole self into this work, and how to model grace, compassion, and concern for all Equity Committee member as we engage in this work. They then participated in a gallery-walk to review responses from other small groups and to identify common themes throughout all responses. Engagement through storytelling and movement will allow the group to think creatively about holistic solutions to this work, and a balance of creative thinking and deep conversations around equity in SPPS.

In closing, members were given the task to identify 3-5 inequities that exist in SPPS for discussion at the January 27, 2020 meeting.

MOTION: Ms. Foster moved the Board accept the report on the December 9, 2019 Equity Committee meeting and approve the minutes and recommended motions within that meeting as published. The motion was seconded by Ms. Vanderwert.

The motion was approved with the following roll call vote:

Ms. Ellis	Yes
Ms. Foster	Yes
Mr. Brodrick	Yes
Ms. Xiong	Yes
Ms. Vanderwert	Yes
Mr. Schumacher	Yes
Mr. Marchese	Yes

VIII. SUPERINTENDENT'S REPORT

A. School Year 2019-20 Enrollment Overview

Superintendent Gothard then invited Chief of Operations, Jackie Turner, to present the School Year 2019-2020 Enrollment Overview to review SY2019-20 Enrollment, Market Share, and details on the Enrollment Task Force. Terminology for the presentation was also reviewed.

How Many Students Are Enrolled? (SY 2019-20)

- SPPS total enrollment for school year 2019 20* is 36,994 PK 12 students.
- SPPS state funded enrollment for school year 2019 20 is 35,906 PK* 12 students; a decrease of 948 students from state funded enrollment for SY 2018-19.
- SPPS state funded enrollment (excluding PK) 35,587 is 323 students below the projected enrollment of 35,910.

Grades | SY 2019-20

- Figures by grade for ECSE, VPK, and K-12 were shown.
- VPK enrollment is 319, another 1088 PK students that are not state funded resulting in 1407
- Largest grade is grade 1; cohort moving from last year's grade K
- Smallest grade is grade 8

Trends | State-Funded Enrollment SY2008-09 to SY 2019-20

- Figures of trends in enrollment were shown.
  - Three years of decline
  - Plateau off between 2012-13 and 2014-15
  - Large drop from SY 2014-15 to SY 2015-16 and another from 2015-16 to 2016-17
  - Slight increase from 2016-17 to 2017-18
  - Decreases since SY 2017-18
- A timeline of enrollment trends was also shown

Impacts from Change in School Start Times on Student Enrollment

Analysis:

- Overall enrollment: Projected trend compared to SY 2019-20 October 1
  - 24 sites changed to earlier start
  - 16 sites changed to later site
  - 28 sites had no change
- Grade comparison: October 1 trend compared to SY 2019-20
  - Kindergarten

Overall Enrollment: Projected Trend Compared to SY2019-20 October 1

Results suggest the change did not appear to impact the overall SY 19-20 enrollment

- Of the 24 sites that went to an earlier start
  - 15 had a declining trend; approximately half of their SY 19-20 enrollment continued to decline; the other half increased
  - The other schools that went to and earlier start; had declines in enrollment no matter the trend
- Of the 16 sites that went to a later start

- Those that had a declining trend had approximately half SY 19-20 enrollment increase and half SY 19-20 enrollment decrease
- Of the 28 sites that had no change to the start time
  - Of those with a declining trend; the SY 19-20 enrollment continued the decline. Of those with an increasing trend; approximately half SY 19-20 enrollment continued the increasing trend and the other half decreased

Grade Comparison: October 1 trend compared to SY 2019-20
Results suggest the change could have impacted K
Kindergarten (N=42)

- SY 19 20 Oct. 1 K enrollment is 2878 (K and SPK), 243 less than Oct. 1 SY 18 19 (3,121). This difference is the largest across grades; In the last four years before 2019 20 the K enrollment has been steady approximately 3100
- SY 19 20 Oct. 1 K projection was 2,878 (K and SPK), 168 less than REA projected (3,046). This difference is the largest across grades
- The ten schools that had the same or higher SY 19 20 K enrollment did not change the start time
- Of the 22 that started earlier, all had an SY 19 20 K enrollment that was lower than the seven year average

Continuation

- Trends were shown for continuation were shown
- Continuation at transitional grades above 70%
- Continuation from grades 8 to 9 remain the highest of the transitional grades
- Historical PreK to K continuation rates are very high at the district level; particularly for EC students in PreK classrooms and full day PreK; above 80%. Trend suggest approximately 80% of last year's PreK is currently in K.

Market Share

- Graphs and maps were shown to depict market share from 2016 to 2019, as well as charts to show the current market share
- 63% school aged resident children attended SPPS
- 21% school aged resident children attended a charter school
- 9% school aged resident children attended a nonpublic school
- 7% school aged resident children attended a neighboring district school via open enrollment
- 0.3% school aged resident children attended other schools
- Figures on alternative enrollment disaggregated by race/ethnicity were also shown for charter schools and nonpublic, open enrollment and other types
- Figures for alternative enrollment disaggregated by grade band were also shown for charter schools and nonpublic, open enrollment and other types

Student Choice/Placement Advisory Task Force

- Purpose:
  - Review for understanding of the school enrollment process
  - Develop recommendations for improving enrollment processing and customer service
  - Review communication and understanding of school capacity and staffing alignment
- Feedback
  - Placement Office survey
  - Exit survey
    - Phase A: Students that were enrolled as of June 1 but did not show up in Fall
      - Grades K-12 as of Fall 2019
      - Address in Saint Paul
    - Phase B: Students enrolled in Fall 2019, but not enrolled as of December
- Next Steps
  - Review programs, building capacity, school choice and enrollment trends throughout the district
    - Task forces and committees

    - Work groups
    - Reports
    - Surveys
  - Quarterly Board Reports

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:

- Board members had questions on how we are collecting information from families who are leaving the district.
- There were further questions on the way data was described in the numbers of buildings that were talked about in the overall enrollment, and their relation to start times and trends. Response: In the analysis, there were three categories to look at projected trends. It may have had a declining, increasing, or stable trend, or no pattern.
- They all had declines regardless of where they were beforehand. Of the ones with declines after start times, how many schools had a decline? 24 schools with change to earlier and how many of them had a decline. Response: That information will be provided.
- The numbers of schools that declines were clarified. It was overall even, and the numbers would be helpful.
- There was also further clarification on the projected and actual number of students enrolled, and methodology by REA.
- Director Brodrick requested clarification in looking at the demographics – it would be more revealing, particularly to find out who's going to other options besides SPPS, and why, and think we might be able to find out more if in the charter school circle, - very interested in whether the demographic group when they enroll in a charter school, are they enrolling in a charter school which is segregated? Response: We know of the students - what charter schools do they attend. We do have the number of students at charter schools and ratios, meaning that we know where each student goes.
- Director Brodrick also noted concerns about charter school movement is that it has created segregated environments. One of the things that SPPS has prided themselves on throughout career and before, fact we were looking for inclusion and as much diversification in as many individual buildings as possible, and we were truly supporting concept and belief and philosophy of integrations. He would like to see the charter school movement has done for integration and diversity in individual schools in the city of St. Paul.
- On nonpublic and open enrollment – concern to see demographic disaggregation broken down by non-public versus open enrollment. We have the total number of kids opting to go to either nonpublic or open enrollment is 35 % white – interested to see percentage of white students going to private schools, as opposed to white kids going to neighboring districts. Particularly interesting because , anecdotally, am talking to others who may fit into any of the demographics and they are sending their kids to neighboring districts. Like to find out whether number of families opting to choose to send their kids to suburban schools. Which relates back to the question which are who is leaving or choosing to not send kids to district, and why. Need more information to begin to answer that honestly and forthrightly. Response: We have heard that and can provide additional data.
- Director Schumacher noted that having the numbers attached to percentages is helpful to know, what that represents. What schools are they coming from, where are they going to, and at what grades is it happening? If kids are leaving one schools and showing up at a suburban school, what is it that is being offered? We have those information. It would also help us to understand how our parents, and if we could do it, know that trying to understand how that lines up with start times, and looking at a particular school and seeing decline, or unpredictable, and they're going to a charter school getting picked up by buses or out of district, better understanding of impact. With the first year of start times, as we look to the future and understand how strategic plan may change as transportation becomes more equitable across regions, how we think about our different school areas and what start times look like and at some point, be able to offer true choice across different areas with start times that appeal to families. It would help to get different understandings, and see better picture of what's happening and right-sizing as we understand more. And what we are able to offer and things never been able to compete.

- Curious about the percentage in our current school district are open enrolled. As parents shared at Public Comment that they open enroll into SPPS, and that information would also be helpful. Response: We can send that data as well.
- Director Marchese noted the observation of the demographics of students in SPPS is very similar to the demographics of students who attend charter schools. It's important to recognize its neither disproportionately students who are white or students of color phenomena. It's mirroring the enrollment of SPPS and that white families and families of color are making choices and that both white families and families of color are making choices in same percentages as they choose SPPS. Think that's helpful, and for open enrollment to understand that. Sometimes heard framing of charter requests and need for charter choice framed around families of color because district isn't serving their needs. Data is showing that it's even with the similar amounts.
- Demographics of overall grade school age population, and total percentage of students, what are the demographics, because that ultimately is the real base we're working from overall.
- Director Brodrick also noted that that there needs to be more details on the reasons why they are leaving or not attending, and reason may or may not have a connection to their particular demographic group that they belong to. Goes back to question of why are people choosing to go to charter schools. Still maintain that the overall percentages of demographics for charter versus SPPS is pretty similar. Don't think charter system in general they were not working to gather to achieve a modicum of integration in their particular buildings, which we have been committed to since before 1954. Response. We will get back to Board with responses. Graphs were shown to compare demographics between charter schools and SPPS.
- In regards to the placement office survey, not familiar with the language test or bilingual test. Do parents know that there is a test when they come to enroll students? That is a long time for parents to wait, have we looked at other ways on how to take this test for new students? Response: Yes, we have that was a recent change with the last contract with SPFE, that we would primarily do that test at the center. As part of contract, do bulk of testing there and took on knowing it would increase time. Try to get through as quickly as possible, and try to have like languages to have the communication path. Multiple staff to help families. It does take time, about 45 minutes to an hour depending on language proficiency. Parents are told over the phone and via the letter, and we do remind them at the center to anticipate to be here at least an hour per child with the assessment. They also do hearing test, eye tests, and vaccinations. It is a full service program.
- On the exit survey, wondering have we taken into account how to catch immediate feedback? In the life of a lot of families, busy and active parents, and if send them a piece of mail – from the district, no longer a part of them. If on the phone find a students has left, and left because of certain reason, make immediate note. In going back to relational teachers know some kids aren't returning, and can we catch that before it happens? Response: We do have some schools and admins that do that – if we they see 3-day or 7-day no show, those schools are actively advising staff to call families, and is there a reason why and ways to help. It does help in some schools. As we get into the swing of exit survey, and get the data closer to 15-day. At the district level, 15-day, technically no longer enrolled after 15 consecutive days. We are whenever a family comes in and is not able to make it work at a particular school, Director Williams and her team make provisions to keep student inside SPPS. We try to find a school within system where they will be happy.
- We capture that information for those students who leave, or families that we've tried everything. Do we keep track of that and add to the data? Response: Yes, we will, and look at that aggregately. If families are telling us they left because of a particular reason, but in the event that's what they're telling, data we will need to look at depending on aggregately and look at policy changes.
- We as board members hear from parents that aren't' happy with certain things, that can be solved maybe. I would think classroom teacher who has students they know have had conversations with parents that would indicate if a child wasn't showing up and why, and some is kept at some schools. Would it be challenging to implement that as regular routine with students no longer at the schools. If kids are leaving, and maybe small percentage, think we'd know why they're leaving. If we could capture that data, it would be helpful. Those are relationships to get honest answers, as opposed to other situations and not responding. Think that teacher would have some sense of dissatisfaction. If we could formalize that in some way could help us. Response: One is verification of attendance, and also the students who leave at all different times. one – can ask chief turner to report back on the standard

verification of enrollment and better standardize that. what do we signal as how many days, and it could be due to t a lot of things. There are number of different scenarios – verification at those standards and outside of regular enrollment times.

- As a superintendent within the metropolitan area and suburban school, and now at an inner city district, what do you see as the answers to the two questions in terms of which families make those decisions and on what basis do they make them? Seeing certain suburban district are losing students to other suburban district. Response: A former colleague used 3 Ps – personal choice, proximity and perception, and any combination. Hope we can learn enough and begin to establish trends to codify in strategic plan and we do offer and how, and places and ask to give us a try. Begin to build momentum and support in that way. We also need to focus on students we have here and serve students here that are ours in incredible ways. It's a "both-and" conversations and we also need to look at reasons why they're leaving, and strengthen why they are staying as well.
    - Director Brodrick noted that absolutely right focus on kids that walk through our doors every morning, and focus on families that choose to send their kids to SPPS. Superintendent Gothard is absolutely right and glad reminded – focus on kids that choose to come to our schools and do best possible job for them.
- Chair Ellis noted that there would be quarterly updates, and appreciate that. Recommendations and when they come to the Board – are those recommendations for the Board to listen to and create policy or resolution to be done, or directive to superintendent and staff. Think that is a challenge in recommendations for the district. Response: Superintendent Gothard shared that it is his job is to bring recommendations to the Board for consideration for strategic direction of the district. If at any time the board has feedback -can direct the superintendent to admin to bring back some next steps or thinking, or recommendation for the full Board to consider, and working in strategic plan for recommendations and how to take in various viewpoints and feedback, and think important to be consistent with communities.
    - Worried that give recommendation to the Board and Superintendent and Administration, and if those things aren't done or not talked about timeline and next steps throughout process, you didn't do what we recommended and why. Response: The first overall recommendations would be for Board to look at comprehensive plan in capacity and alignment – not in piecemeal, but to look at the overall plan and timeline.
- What is the timeframe for this, and if this will be comprehensive plan verses piece. What is the commitment for when we will have a comprehensive plan on this. Response: Like to present to Superintendent Leadership team, first quarter of 2020.
- Would there be an expectation by March or April with comprehensive plan? Response: Yes, we will have a timeline. Not the full plan. We need input from committees for the plan.
- The timeline by April was noted, and the plan going-forward. There may be phases and timelines for implementation, but not the whole scale of the plan, which will require input from parents and families and community. The timeline could establish the window of time for recommendations and set them as milestones, and accomplishments in engagement, and information gathering, and feasibility, and provide information along the way. The plan will be presented at a later date.
- It was also noted that in this process of trying to figure out at what point will the board receive recommendations that require action that will give us the kind of overview we need to make decisions on program configuration, building usage, attendance zones and indifferent factors. There is some urgency and want to see done well. Response: Wondering if Board entertain timeline in January or February to give time to react if going down right direction and make modifications prior to any recommendations of a plan in March or April . Believe come and in January board of ed and come with a timeline. There is nice a lot of background details to consider.
- Do think it's also important to be attention and work to examine assignment areas. moved to a system 6-7 years ago and haven't had study on impact of choices, how families making choices based on options, including transportation, and heard throughout the city who continue to ask questions why they do or do not have access to a program or transportation – what was the impact of choices and how did it impact enrollment .important to include, and hope that will be included.
- Director Marchese noted that the only other aspect or urgency – should feed into the reconfiguration of facilities plan, in making choices in buildings, making choices in renovation and usage that will flow from that. Makes it difficult to make long-term commitments on choices with buildings if not clear yet.

Longer we wait, the harder it is to know what those choices will be, and if don't, impact physical renovation process.

- School Choice Fair is driver of things – do we give everyone list of things – what are you looking for in a school that could drive information? Response: The School Choice Fair it is January 25th. We are trying new location at the Union Depot downtown and it will be 9:30am-2:00pm, with ample parking, and we will be surveying families and choices and why.
- As noted in the timeline and timeline which suggests actual plan of action, I'd ask – we have been in a declining enrollment trend for multiple years. Do we see enrollment, but decline in enrollment of symptom of something that we need to correct? Response: Yes, but with details and empirical evidence and gathering information. Also getting multiple conversations in increasing enrollment, looking at building capacity use and look at scale to adequately staff and be sustainable. We can now look at who we are, students are and the programs offered, and make sure we can do that in a sustainable way. Building capacity is one. And continue to work to gain students, and can't continue to operate buildings far under capacity when scraping by to offer what community wants, and it's finding that balance.
- Board members noted this is the beginning of the discussion as we work to recognize enrollment trends and market share in SPPS, and address that we are providing for the students who do come to our schools. On the other hand, also determining reasons for the students who are not coming to our schools and working on and improving. We want to have as many kids come to SPPS and give them a great education. If there are people moving away, we also want to know why.

B. Facilities Master Plan External Review - Update on Implementation of Recommendations

Chief Turner then presented an update on the implementation of recommendations from the Facilities Master Plan External Review.

Recommendations were categorized into Oversight, Controls, Staffing, or Financing. They were also noted as Recommendations Implemented, Recommendations in Process, Recommendations in Consideration, or Recommendations not Being Implemented. In total, there are 16 in Oversight, 13 in Controls, 4 in Staffing, and 19 in Financing. Full details can be found in the presentation.

FMP External Review Recommendations categories were also described within Oversight, Controls, Staffing, and Financing. Full details can be found in the presentation.
BOE gate-check approvals of large projects greater than $2M were presented with the gate-check, gate name, and format. Further details with input/information and resulting actions were also shown. Full details can be found in the presentation.

Finance Update

- Issuance of January 2020 COP sale will fund projects currently in progress
- Funding schedule will align with construction phases
- Staying within annual program budget strategy
  - Certificates of Participation (COP): $70 million annually
  - Capital Bond (CAP): $15 million annually
  - Long Term Facility Maintenance (LTFM): $27 million

Capital Projects (underway in FY20)

- American Indian Magnet (addition and remodel)
- Bruce Vento (re-visioning)
- District Service Facility (addition and remodel)
- Frost Lake Elementary (remodel)
- Johnson High School (building systems)
- Phalen Lake Hmong Studies (remodel)
- Washington Technology Magnet (athletic improvements)
- District-wide A/V
- District-wide cameras

- Window Replacements
- Roof Replacements
- Other Small Miscellaneous Projects

Certificates of Participation: Example
COPs: setting and approving sale tonight for:
- Como Park H.S.
- District Service Facility
- American Indian Magnet
- Cherokee
- Ramsey
- TOTAL: $70M
- Receive funds in February 2020
- Separate consent agenda

Next Steps
- Detailed outline of recommendations being implemented
- Will present within next 90-120 days
  - Current program financial overview with coordinated financial schedule
  - New project and program control systems
  - Validation of priorities
  - Chartering (scope, budget) of projects and commitments as appropriate
    - "A new baseline"
- Renovate vs. Renew buildings BOE workshop

Renovate v. Renew: Strategic Evaluation
Multi-faceted strategic evaluation, not simple arithmetic formula:
- Financially prudent based on threshold of building's replacement cost?
  - Must consider if building has useful life of 30 - 50 years
  - Will renovation meet needs of teaching and learning equivalent to new construction?
- Impact to families and school community
  - Relocating school disruptive to students, staff, families
  - Risk decreased enrollment whereby school program may never fully recover
- Urban districts have unique logistical constraints, lack of land
  - Right-size buildings on small parcels of land while still meeting 21st century learning needs
- Schools part of social fabric and identity of neighborhoods
- Environmental impact of tearing down and rebuilding

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:
- Clarification on slides 2 and 3 - because they work in correlations and total number of recommendations from FMP External Report. In slide 3, there is number of recommendation in progress? Response: This is a sample of the ones starting, not inclusive of all lists. Other recommendations working on – ones heard most often board interested in each month, there would be an FMP update and report every month in how implementing recommendations. These are ones most interest to the Board
- In the recommendations, are we looking at moving and all the recommendations and implementing them, or a point where we get an update on what are the recommendations we will be implementing, and those that administration will deem not doable. Is there a point to understand what accepted from report, and understand that. Response: Yes, these are recommendation believe we can implement to help with overall program. The board will have greater oversight and line of sight to the projects brought forward for approval. One is internal in recommendations guiding our work, and take that to build to recommendations utilizing those external review recommendations.
- Are there any recommendations in the report that we're not going to move forward with? Response: Response: This information presents all recommendations, and how and if they will be implemented. There are at least 1 that will not be implemented. In consideration – of the 52 total recommendations, how many are we not implementing is 1 right now. We also have 24 in considerations, which means

need more time to work through those and work with Jacobs if feasible and to implement in SPPS and still under review. Hope in January more clarification on those under consideration and move. Those 5 in implementation that are in the works and already been implemented. In progress - it's intended to provide ongoing dashboard to how we are rolling with implementation of overall review.

- There was further discussion on the chart of recommendations from the team, and of those 16, 1 of the recommendations have already implementation, 11 are in the process of being implementation, 4 of them haven't decided if best to implement in SPPS.
- For Board gate checks – began to implement and start that process, on projects to come, haven't done board gate check yet – these are with projects to come. FMP oversight committee agreed to accept, but hasn't been implemented yet because we don't' have official committee.
- There will be more regular reports to the Board on this area.
- Director Brodrick requested more information and summary on the recommendations on the review team report, which have bene pulled out in this presentation to be further discussed. He also requested a list of the recommendations by category, and their next steps in short form, in what we can do, or have chosen not to implement, and if not, why we are not. Response: Behind each recommendations, there is a project management schedule that shows each step to ensure it is implemented. That information can be shared with the Board.
- Board is not requesting to be involved in details of how implement or not implement at particular recommendation, but nice to know that we spent time, energy and money to have review team, and gave recommendations and should have idea of which recommendations work on and which ones not work on.
- Keep it simple for board members. Response: Duly noted and note of that for next month's update.
- Director Schumacher requested more information on Como Senior High – that's one project that is still being competed. How much would that cost, and then a better understanding of what happens if to the other projects if we just say we want money for Como and to get money for that, and trying to. Everyone agree process that the cart was before the horse, and now we have the opportunity to get horse in front of cart. Do we take care of what we need to do right now with money at our disposal and put horse before cart so we go through process to understand and this process informed before decision and understand money. Or do we say we understand period of transition and if we don't grab money right now, it won't be available for any of these projects and those ramifications, preference to put horse before cart and start using process to inform us to look at AIM in particular. Also concerns that the commitment to AIM and community feeling for that school and site and everything involved with that school, and community feel we're starting to really honor and respect of the things trying to get across to us, and worried that if we say we're not going to do AIM for a year and get the money, it also have implications more that dollars and cents. It does come down to what money is available now, how long is it available, and can we put horse before the cart now, after we've taken care of Como, or are there things to make compelling case for doing the rest of it right now. Response: There are many options in looking at this for the approval of the COP. In looking at the projects that were in the construction phase and also ones upcoming in current fiscal year for design and predesign. Five listed are ones that we were planning for this fiscal year and the ones planned. We do know that Como currently has a little shy of $5M that has been spent for the COPs. We know there's an immediate need to cover funds for that expense. The District Service Facility and need for that because it's currently underway, the other 3 were planned for design or predesign in the year.
- In looking at $70M that's available is available for our levy currently doing this evening, and built into a schedule. We'd need to issue COPs until early next summer before that time period would expire. We have this opportunity to issue, but again have market rates that are positive right now for interest and opportunity to do bond refunding, and also GO bonds. It's taking a full look at the market and combining different opportunities with bond rating agencies. It's looking at cost savings when doing multiple things at once. Opportunity to have 3 other schools on COPs doesn't harm anything. If we delay projects, the funding would be available at any time for those projects and held in fund balance. At some point, renovation and repair on buildings, there were letters to the commissioner as to plan what projects not the plan to be done at those sites, and if there are needs in the building, that work could be done it's the timing that funding would be available as the Board would approve the release of funding based on the process.

- As we've been thinking about the renovation versus replacement, it's confusing that we have some significant projects where the decision making impacts the district finances relatively heavily. It was based on a FMP that goes back a period of time. We've now come to a place where we understand going through level setting of process. For those projects significant scope, why not put back through process and do with other projects. Why are we treating some significant expenditures and having them go forward as proposed and including them in revised process that we've been talking about and presented? Response: We can consider that. One of the reasons for AIM that a significant amount of work wasn't for renovation, but also for building improvements to the structure to the building. We believe that building and its location physically – that would be a building regardless of where we go with FMP or aligned in capacity with programming needs, a a building that we'd need and want to maintain within fleet of sites and it is in a prime location. that one wouldn't necessarily consider renovate versus new and put back in because of the work – it needs to be done regardless. There's work that needs to be done beyond remodeling and structural things that need to do.
- Director Marchese also shared that it goes back to 1 – change in cost estimate that was shown in special meeting and included additional work and moment in time and replace vs renovate should be happening with board understanding decision making process. Also because of other conversations to have – it affects our ability to fund other choices down the line. Still having regular conversations around enrollment so that we're making commitments where obviously in midst of renovations like Como and Humboldt. With the AIM building, we haven't put a shovel in ground or opened a wall. Before incur expense, seems like develop systemic approach for those not at that point of construction, consider it in the same way. We may end up in same place, 90-100 day pause, why not include in 90-120 day pause, and help us to understand decisions and where fits into overall spectrum of projects and come back with reasons and what it will be used for, and why this building now versus later. Realize did approve based on different model, but don't know what stock to put in that. Agreed need to pause and reset. There is a concept in law to wipe slate clean and start again, and hearing in recommendations, wiping slate clean and starting again. If that is the case, why keeping legacy decision alive? Response: Yes, think we're saying the same thing but getting there differently. It was intention of administration to wipe slate clean with project in pre-design and beyond. AIM, Frost Lake, District Service Center, Washington Tech athletic field and those 5 schools in the design phase, spent significant amount of time with community and architects and to plan and design those. Yes, we learned through process to include additional contingencies, and initial estimates were off and increase those intention of admin based on COPs authority and other allocations, that those projects would continue. projects in pre-design and beyond, Cherokee and Ramsey, would move forward in full process of gate point checks we also felt in the timeline that we had, we had the opportunity secure funding now given COP and put that up in a reserve account, and once the Board looked at AIM, Bruce Vento, or overall plan on refresh vs build over, that the Board would feel that they had enough info to feel confident about both recommendations. - the data long with them prepared to share, come to conclusion of the due diligence has been done and looked at renovate vs tear down and rebuild, and align with COP sale. Trying to put something together for Board in next 30-45 days, with money from COP is coming in February and still have the time to say no, not comfortable moving forward with AIM and money stay held in the district to use for AIM moving forward, depending on timing and ability to do that. Intention and hope to be work there – talking about taking advantage of opportunity of COPs now given the goal and recommendation. Chief Baker also in support in Chief Turner, Jacobs the external consultant – highlight they pressed us on questions during their sessions a few weeks ago on build new vs renovate. conversations with them I and team provided them to rationale and reasons why to go down this road. We can specifically provide with that information on why we chose this route vs the other to get to the concerns.
- Concern is that asking this board to incur obligations on behalf of the district, and not giving information to help understand why we're going to use funds in particular way. Not fair to make decision without complete information to understand and justify to community. Asked us to vote and issue certificates of participation through affirmative vote and haven't provided specifics with discussion to renovate versus build new. How do I got back to the community and explain what I am voting for and what the community will receive as result of funding. No explanation to any of us, entire focus has been predicated on the desire to vote and affirm a sale of which we don't have enough information. part of the agitations, and concerns about we don not have a budget that ties funding to specific projects, do not have explanation why now is opportunity, it seems there are projects already in process need to

pay for and make sense to move forward because we have to pay for them, for ones with significant funding and debt and take vote on it, don't have information for tonight's' vote. Certificate of Participation is unique to city of Saint Paul and provides to not go to voters and we stand in the shoes of the voters whatever provide to us should be equalivalt to provided to the community, and that hasn't been provided, and why vote for it at that level. Help to understand how to explain to people. Response: We are asking for the money that we have authority. Not using until the Board feels confident with that. If Admin presents something within next 30 days if we do new vs renovate at AIM, if Board aligns with recommendation, continue to move forward with AIM. in the event board says no not ready to move forward, would have missed window in March. If not in March 2020, put off decision for at least a year. Every decision has long term impact and cost more money. Learned from previous experience, financially, feel good about 3 major projects a year – that's where able to be successful. Examined going into this with 6 different projects - didn't do that well. As we begin to backlog projects, find selves in position 10 year program, is now 15-20 years. Think main piece and intention was to receive resources if in fact we needed it. If we get past March and decided need money, missed window for it and put decision off for a year. AIM has been working hard at admin level, community level, and had a lot of support from community, and anticipating making improvements in building . It was not about increasing enrollment, but improving environment for instruction. Regardless if build new or renovate, feel community deserves opportunity improve learning experiences. Chief Schrul added that in order to finance FMP, have to have financing. A part of this $70M is setting forth future financing for projects we have opportunities during the year to finance for future projects, and the opportunity to have these 5 sites listed does not obligate the Board to spend on those 5. The two under construction are first 3 listed –the other 3 does not obligate board din any way. Finance needs to do what it needs to do to get funds for the FMP, and if we want to include to improve buildings and continue work. The market right and conditions and Baker Tilly has advised us is the market is in our favor to issue certificates of participation at this time that gives favorable interest rates that coming to at this event.

- There were also questions on waiting 2 months until more information is available to vote on sale of the Certificates of Participation.
- Director Marchese noted that this situation seems similar to the current state of the FMP, and the decisions that need to be made by the Board right now and the actions and information given to the Board to make them feel comfortable in speaking to the community on those decisions. It has to do with what does the Board need to know to make educated decision to how it exercises its discretion.
- Understand from financial standpoint, we have a few months; from design, we don't. If we wait to February, we have missed window and can't start for another year.
- Questions on the timing were addressed, and Chief Schrul provides the Board with scenarios with COPs and if we waited and did partially. The schedule for setting sale and receive of funds was reviewed. It's a three month process to then go forward with the schedule. Whatever time period that would be, not get into any site not having that ability to have funds available.

C. Human Resource Transactions

MOTION: Mr. Schumacher moved approval of the HR Transactions for the period November 1, 2019 through November 30, 2019. Ms. Xiong seconded the motion.

The motion was approved with the following roll call vote:

Ms. Ellis	Yes
Ms. Foster	Yes
Mr. Brodrick	Yes
Ms. Xiong	Yes
Ms. Vanderwert	Yes
Mr. Schumacher	Yes
Mr. Marchese	Yes

IX. CONSENT AGENDA

MOTION: Ms. Ellis moved approval of all items within the Consent Agenda with item D10 – Approval of the Memorandum of Understanding for the Rent Supplement Pilot Program pulled for separate consideration. The motion was seconded by Mr. Marchese.

The motion was approved with the following roll call vote:

Ms. Ellis	Yes
Ms. Foster	Yes
Mr. Brodrick	Yes
Ms. Xiong	Yes
Ms. Vanderwert	Yes
Mr. Schumacher	Yes
Mr. Marchese	Yes

A. Gifts

BF 31860 Request for Permission to Accept Donation from Ecolab to Cherokee Heights Elementary School

That the Board of Education authorize the Superintendent (designee) to accept the donation and have the funds used to support student achievement outcomes at Cherokee Heights Elementary School.

BF 31861 Gift Acceptance from Hiway Credit Union Foundation, Inc.

That the Saint Paul public Schools Board of Education authorize the Superintendent Gothard to allow Como Park Senior High School to accept a monetary gift from Hiway Credit Union Foundation of $5200. The money will be deposited into the Como Park Senior High intra-school account, 19-212-291-000-5096-U001, and will be used with the above projects.

BF 31862 Acceptance of Gift from the United States Tennis Association

That the Board of Education authorize the Superintendent (or Designee) to accept the gifts from the United States Tennis Association.

BF 31863 Donation of Zuiker Press Books to 6-12 Libraries and Middle School ELA Classrooms

That the Board of Education authorize the Superintendent (designee) to accept the gift of new books to be distributed to multiple school libraries and classrooms.

B. Grants

BF 31864 Request for Permission to Accept a Grant from the H.B. Fuller Company Foundation

That the Board of Education authorize the Superintendent (designee) to accept two mini-grants from the H.B. Fuller Company Foundation to support STEM education at Washington Technology Magnet School; to accept funds; and to implement the projects as specified in the award documents.

BF 31865 Request for Permission to Accept a Sub-Award Grant from Goodwill Easter Seals of Minnesota

That the Board of Education authorize the Superintendent (designee) to accept a sub-award from Goodwill Easter Seals of Minnesota for funds to support the Business Service Pathway Program; to accept funds; and to implement the project as specified in the award documents.

BF 31866 Request for Permission to Submit a Grant to the Mark A. Pursley Memorial Foundation

That the Board of Education authorize the Superintendent (designee) to submit a grant application to the Mark A. Pursley Memorial Foundation for funds to design and provide training to all school counselors and social workers on acute suicide crisis management and effective intervention steps; to accept funds, if awarded; and to implement the project as specified in the award documents.

BF 31867 Request for Permission to Submit a Grant Application to the Minnesota Agricultural Education Leadership Council

That the Board of Education authorize the Superintendent (designee) to submit a grant to the Minnesota Agricultural Education Leadership Council for funds to expand Como Park Senior High School's Natural Resources Pathway program; to accept funds if awarded; and to implement the project as specified in the award documents.

BF 31868 Request for Permission to Submit a Grant to the Minnesota Department of Education – STEM AP/IB Program - Central

That the Board of Education authorize the Superintendent (designee) to submit a grant application to the Minnesota Department of Education for funds to build an IB Career Programme and form a site team to review advanced coursework data at Central High School; to accept funds, if awarded; and to implement the project as specified in the award documents.

BF 31869 Request for Permission to Submit a Grant to the Minnesota Department of Education – STEM AP/IB Program - Creative Arts Secondary

That the Board of Education authorize the Superintendent (designee) to submit a grant application to the Minnesota Department of Education for funds update an existing AP course, send staff to AVID Summer Institute training and providing tutoring to students at Creative Arts Secondary School; to accept funds, if awarded; and to implement the project as specified in the award documents.

BF 31870 Request for Permission to Submit a Grant to the Professional Educator Licensing and Standards Board

That the Board of Education authorize the Superintendent (designee) to submit a grant application to the Professional Educator Licensing and Standards Board for funds to plan an induction coaching program; to accept funds, if awarded; and to implement the project as specified in the award documents.

BF 31871 Request for Permission to Accept a Grant from the Target Foundation

That the Board of Education authorize the Superintendent (designee) accept a grant from the Target Foundation for additional enhancements to a mini-pitch in Saint Paul Public Schools; to accept funds; and to implement the project as specified in the award documents.

BF 31872 Request for Permission to Accept a Grant from the Hiway Credit Union Foundation

That the Board of Education authorize the Superintendent (designee) to accept a grant from the Hiway Credit Union Foundation to support music curriculum at Harding; to accept funds if awarded; and to implement the project as specified in the award documents.

BF 31873 Request for Permission to Accept a Grant from the Bush Foundation

That the Board of Education authorize the Superintendent (designee) to accept a grant from the Bush Foundation for funds to support student-centered learning at Hamline Elementary School; to accept funds; and to implement the project as specified in the award documents.

C. Contracts

BF 31874 Contract Approval for Emergency Transportation

That the Board of Education authorizes the Superintendent (designee) to award contracts based on district need for yellow school bus vendors.

D. Agreements

BF 31875 Approval of an Employment Agreement with the North Central States Regional Council of Carpenters to Establish Terms and Conditions of Employment for 2019-2022

That the Board of Education of Independent School District No. 625 approve and adopt the Agreement concerning the terms and conditions of employment of those employees in this school district for whom the North Central States Regional Council of Carpenters, is the exclusive representative; duration of said Agreement is for the period of May 1, 2019 through April 30, 2022.

BF 31876 Approval of an Employment Agreement with International Union of Painters and Allied Trades District Council 82/Local 1324 representing Glaziers, to Establish Terms and Conditions of Employment for 2019-2022

That the Board of Education of Independent School District No. 625 approve and adopt the Employment Agreement concerning the terms and conditions of employment of those employees in this school district for whom the International Union of Painters and Allied Trades District Council 82 Local 1324 representing Glaziers, is the exclusive representative; duration of said agreement is for the period of June 1, 2019 through May 31, 2022.

BF 31877 Approval of Employment Agreement Between Independent School District No. 625, Saint Paul Public Schools, and District Lodge No. 77 International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers AFL-CIO, Exclusive Representative for Machinists

That the Board of Education of Independent School District No. 625 approve and adopt the Agreement concerning the terms and conditions of employment of those machinist employees in this school district for whom District Lodge No. 77 International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers AFL-CIO, is the exclusive representative; duration of said Agreement is for the period of July 1, 2019 through June 30, 2021.

BF 31878 Approval of Employment Agreement Between Independent School District No. 625, Saint Paul Public Schools, and Minnesota Teamsters Local 320, Exclusive Representative for Nutrition Services Employees

That the Board of Education of Independent School District No. 625 approve and adopt the Agreement concerning the terms and conditions of employment of those nutrition services employees in this District for whom the Minnesota Teamsters Local No. 320 is the exclusive representative; duration of said Agreement is for the period of July 1, 2019 through June 30, 2021.

BF 31879 Lease Agreement with Teatro del Pueblo

That the Board of Education authorize the Superintendent to execute a Lease Agreement between the District and Teatro del Pueblo to lease space at the Baker Center, 209 Page Street, St. Paul, MN for the term January 1, 2020 through December 31, 2021, with monthly rent of Six Hundred Twenty-Six and 66/100 Dollars ($626.66) subject to all other terms and conditions of said agreement.

BF 31880 Lease Agreement with Youth Farm

That the Board of Education authorize the Superintendent to execute a Lease Agreement between the District and Youth Farm to lease space at the Baker Center located at 209 West Page Street, St. Paul, MN 55107 for the term January 1, 2020 through December 31, 2021, with monthly rent of Four Hundred Nineteen and 16/100 dollars ($419.16) subject to all other terms and conditions of said agreement.

BF 31881 Lease Agreement with West Side Community Organization

That the Board of Education authorize the Superintendent to execute a Lease Agreement between the District and West Side Community Organization to lease space at the Baker Center, 209 Page Street, St. Paul, MN for the term January 1, 2020 through December 31, 2021, with monthly rent of Six Hundred Forty-Eight and 63/100 Dollars ($648.63) subject to all other terms and conditions of said agreement.

BF 31882 Lease Agreement with YMCA

That the Board of Education authorize the Superintendent to execute a Lease Agreement between the District and YMCA to lease space at the Baker Center, 209 Page Street, St. Paul, MN for the term January 1, 2020 through December 31, 2021, with monthly rent of Two Hundred Fifty-Four and 77/100 Dollars ($254.77) subject to all other terms and conditions of said agreement.

BF 31883 Children's Defense Fund Freedom Schools Summer Learning Program

That the Board of Education authorize the Superintendent (designee) to approve the expending of ALC funds In the amount of $142,500 to provide professional support for overall program operations including training for CDF Freedom Schools staff, according to the CDF model, and also provide for the purchasing of curriculum and books for teachers and students to use for instructional and learning purposes during the CDF Freedom Schools Summer Learning Programs.

E. Administrative Items

BF 31884 Monthly Operating Authority

1. That the Board of Education approve and ratify the following checks and wire transfers for the period October 1, 2019 – October 31, 2019.

(a) General Account	#717237-718890 #0003514-0003541 #7003478-7003520 #0003990-0004094	$57,274,061.72
(b) Debt Service	-0-	$0.00
(c) Construction	-0-	$4,945,488.77
		$62,219,550.49

Included in the above disbursements are two payrolls in the amount of $38,989,654.49 and overtime of $214,359.80 or 0.55% of payroll.

(d) Collateral Changes

Released:

None

Additions:

None

That the Board of Education further authorize payment of properly certified cash disbursements including payrolls, overtime schedules, compensation claims, and claims under the Workers' Compensation Law falling within the period ending March 31, 2020.

BF 31885 Recommendations for Exclusion of Students in Non-Compliance with Minnesota Statute 123.70 Health Standards: Immunizations

That the Board of Education excludes the named students from school effective January 6, 2020, should they not comply with Minnesota State Health Standards for Immunizations on or before this date.

BF 31886 Upgrade of the Unclassified Position of MARSS Supervisor for Independent School District No. 625 and Relevant Terms and Conditions of Employment

That the Board of Education of Independent School District No. 625 approve the establishment of the unclassified MARSS Supervisor classification effective December 23, 2019 to grade 20; that the Board of Education declare the position of MARSS Supervisor as unclassified and that the pay rate for this position would be equivalent to grade 20 standard ranges.

BF 31887 Amendment to Superintendent Contract

That the Board of Education:

1. Approve the Amendment to Superintendent Contract changing Paragraph VI, E to read:

   Health Insurance Premiums. The School District shall pay the premium costs for health and hospitalization insurance, under its group plan, for Superintendent and his dependents not to exceed a School District contribution of $1,500 per month.

F. Bids

BF 31888 Bid No. A20-0429-A District Service Facility Kitchen Boiler Replacement

That the Board of Education authorize the award of Bid No. A20-0429-A District Service Facility Kitchen Boiler Replacement to Kraft Mechanical, LLC for a lump sum base bid of $620,424.

G. Change Orders

CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS PULLED FOR SEPARATE CONSIDERATION:

BF 31889 Approval of the Memorandum of Understanding for the Rent Supplement Pilot Program with the City of St. Paul, St. Paul Public Housing Agency, Amherst H. Wilder Foundation, Model Cities of St. Paul Inc, Neighborhood House, Community Stabilization Project, YWCA St. Paul and St. Paul City Schools

This item was pulled for further information. Assistant Superintendent Andrew Collins and Anne McInerney provided more details to talk about the work in partnership with the city and rent supplement pilot program. Andrew Collins provided background details in launching at 6 of our schools. All agree that children have safe and stable housing to school success aims to serve lowest income families who bear highest cost burden and most at risk of losing housing. This program will provide each eligible family with $300 per month and wrap-around services for 3 years. Anne McInerney then provided context. We do appreciate city of Saint Paul and partners and funding available for families most in need. Our program with Project Reach has found that preventing homelessness is key piece. This is providing a resource for families that are in need, meet income guidelines, and child in 3rd grade or under, and already be on lease. Take in referrals and send to city on connecting and work with landlords on providing rent supplement. Chief Baker also shared that Anne, Andrew, and the City of Saint Paul and Mayor Carter share excitement to move forward in launching this.

Director Vanderwert noted she is excited about this wok and has data to back it up in her previous experience and shared details with her experience and how it positively impacted the family and students. It makes a huge difference in school performance, and research on homelessness and impacts brains of young children and it is devastating. She congratulated staff on getting it started, and it will make a difference.

Director Foster also congratulated all those involved and thanked the Reach team in work and advocacy. Prevention is the key. Talk about how kids are show up or unable to show up and super excited and grateful that the city is standing on its sword and invest and support families. Thanks and thanks for keeping updated and all work of Project Reach is doing.

MOTION: Ms. Vanderwert moved approval that the Board of Education authorize the Superintendent (designee) to approve the Memorandum of Understanding for the Rent Supplement Pilot Program. The motion was seconded by Ms. Foster.

The motion was approved with the following roll call vote:

Ms. Ellis	Yes
Ms. Foster	Yes
Mr. Brodrick	Yes
Ms. Xiong	Yes
Ms. Vanderwert	Yes
Mr. Schumacher	Yes
Mr. Marchese	Yes

X. OLD BUSINESS

A. Policy Update
1. THIRD READING: 510.03 - Class Rankings

Chief of Staff, Cedrick Baker, then presented the third reading of Policy 510.03 – Class Rankings.

510.03: Class Rankings
Why are updates being proposed?

- At the May 22, 2018 Board of Education meeting, the Student Engagement and Advancement Board (SEAB) presented on the inequities of the current policy.
- They recommended that SPPS, “Implement consistent recognition of academic achievement by updating policy 510.03.”
- They proposed for the district to:

- Celebrate academic success of more students
- Remove the verbiage, "the top ten students ranked by grade point average of each high school's senior class will be identified and recognized in alphabetical order" from the current policy
- Develop consistent use and logic of weighted course material that supports a district-wide system for recognizing academic honors

Changes to the policy include:

- Removing "the top ten" verbiage (currently paragraph two)
- Adding this language (proposed paragraph two):
  - *2. Students will be recognized for academic achievement based on the Latin Honor system, using their weighted GPA.*
    - *High Honors with Distinction (Summa Cum Laude) — Cumulative GPA average of 4.000 and above*
    - *High Honors (Magna Cum Laude) — Cumulative GPA average of 3.75 to 3.99*
    - *Honors (Cum Laude) — Cumulative GPA average of 3.3 to 3.749*

Implications of proposed changes:

- The District will no longer host the "Celebration of Excellence" which honored the top ten from each high school
  - The cost savings from no longer hosting the "Celebration of Excellence" will be used to buy cords and help to support individual high schools' celebrations
  - High school principals have requested for Board members and Senior Leadership Team to have a presence/role at their school-level celebrations
- High schools that do not currently have the GPA cutoffs for honors, high honors, and high honors with distinction as stated in the proposed policy, will have to update their internal systems and practices and communicate those changes to students and families.

  Because we are doing away with "top ten" - who have been acknowledged in newspapers historically - the District will need to find a new way to best recognize students publically that appeal to newspapers

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:

- SEAB Member Ali noted that the idea for this policy is also to encourage graduating students to take classes that they like, rather than classes that are weighted. The SEAB members who proposed this idea are now in college, and the current SEAB members encourage the Board to approve this policy change.

BF 31890 THIRD READING: 510.03 - Class Rankings

MOTION: Mr. Schumacher moved approval of the updates to Policy 510.03 – Class Rankings. The motion was seconded by Ms. Foster.

The motion was approved with the following roll call vote:

Ms. Ellis	Yes
Ms. Foster	Yes
Mr. Brodrick	Yes
Ms. Xiong	Yes
Ms. Vanderwert	Yes
Mr. Schumacher	Yes
Mr. Marchese	Yes

B. Security and Emergency Management Vision SY20 and Beyond, and Agreement with City of St. Paul Police Department for Shared Costs of School Resource Officers (SROs)

Chief Turner then provided information on Security and Emergency Management's Visition SY20 and Beyond, including providing SEM's vision, providing SRO data, and recommendation of approval of the 2019-20 SRO contract.

Vision SY20 and Beyond

- A diagram showing the support for students in this department was shown, including Safety Emergency Management and Security, Security Guards, School Resource Officers, Community Support Liaisons, and School Support Liaisons.
- Student centered support was also shown, with the different roles of SEM, SROs, Guards, CSLs and SSLs.
- SEM's team of dedicated professionals was also shown throughout the Fall 2019, Spring 2020, and SY21 and Beyond, and showing the additions of Restorative Practices EA in Fall 2019, Restorative Practices EA and SSLs in Spring 2020, and Restorative Practices EA, Social Worker, and Security Guards and SSLs in SY 21 and beyond.

2019 Year End Review – SRO Data

- Arrest data trends from 2012 to 2019 were shown
- List of 4/5 offenses versus arrests were shown
- Use of force details were also presented with figures from 2016-17 to 2018-19

2019-2020 SRO Contract

- One year agreement for 7 SROs
  - NOT TO EXCEED $775,000 per year
  - 90/10 Split of actual salary expenses
    - SPPD provides an additional .5 FTE SRO
    - SPPD provides full time Sergeant
- SPPS to capture potential savings within 2019-2020
  - Higher pay senior officers replaced by lower paid officers
  - Short term vacancy - 2 month savings

Next Steps

- Partnership
  - SPPD/SPPS
- Feedback
  - Students, SROs, Administrators
- Continuous Improvement
  - Safety, Security & Emergency Management Vision
  - FY21 SRO Contract

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:

- In talking about the people involved in the overall security and safety plans, how do our mental health workers and other support staff in schools fit into this? Response: Each school has a team of professionals with the primary person in the mental health, such as social workers, psychologists, or social worker, or counselor, are typically the key person to bring the team together. Other partners, including teachers and partners sit on that team to talk about how to improve the climate at the school. Some schools have students leading the team. All positions are active, but looks different at each building. It's most important to let the school lead that work and allow them to decide their needs, and SEM fills in with infrastructure and their needs, as well as with our lead social work department.
- If there are incidents that the social worker or mental health professional, they can help with their part of the approach of the student in need of additional support, as well as the SRO? Response: Depending on the situation, the SROs are typically brought in as a point of reference for information, as well as to be able to be that link to the community, and bring forth other partners from other students and staff that may have information. They also come in and work with to provide the supports for the prevention piece. In many cases, SROs are available for informal drop-ins for our students, and students have become comfortable with their SROs and going to them for questions and feedback.
- Some have suggested social workers instead of SROs – speak to why recommending SROs? Response: This is not one or the other; it's both-and. Seven SROs cannot prevent all of the crime or provide mental health of a social worker. There is a strong core team and looking to provide a whole

picture with social workers, psychologists, and counselors. They are a part of the vision. Rather than just safety and security, we need to talk about climate. They are – not instead of in the vision of this program.

- Director Xiong shared that she is excited about the social worker joining the SEM team in 2021, and to give perspective on responding to crisis and student mental health but also to and hoping that the trauma recovery with students and to also give perspective to staff who are responding to crisis in our school district, and exciting that the social worker is joining. Glad that is happening and need more perspective and expertise in mental health in how we respond to crises in the district and in society.
- Director Foster thanked Laurie Olson and SEM team – it's nice to see a foundational process in where we are moving in supports. Again, agree there is work to do with Chief and Mayor and continue to struggle, and with quantitative and qualitative data. We are beginning to see qualitative data, and some students can attest to interactions that may have disrupted the prison pipeline because of SROs. There is still community work to happen. Struggled with the data collection that accurately reflects the totality of the population – not 1-2 schools and data flows. If be accurate about needs and purposes, hopeful that looking at regular process, and feedback coming from all parties involved moving forward.
- Movement is happening and work is being done. Excited about CSL and SSL process and talking about supports in mental health supports and ongoing process. Happy that were are getting more concrete, and concrete this is for community to engage and ask questions, and model schools with Como that we can pull data from those. Thanks for the work, still have work to do around this.
- Director Marchese echoed comments in the structure presented. he reiterated that it's important to see the web of people involved with creating the kind of culture we want for our students. Also understanding of how SROs fit into as piece of puzzle and not outside and away form this. More we can do to knit this together so that students and adults in the building understand this is a team and operating as a team, with discrete responsibilities. We also worked hard about the role of SROs to play in building issues, and clarify the roles they do have and important of district staff in disciplinary circumstances and hope with differentiations with support staff, and for the CSLs and SSLs to be in the process.
- He raised in years past, and continues to be concerned and frustrated on the cost of the contract. In addition, know there is limited amount of leverage to influence that and know have tried numerous different ways. Encourage to continue to seek value for district tin the cost – 90/10 is not split, it's vendor relationship. We are not in vendor relationship with police- they are in our community and required to serve us. Recognize goodwill between police department and district is important, and having officers trained well and understand come to work with respectful and clear mindset is valuable, and not necessarily get that from a beat or street cop. Recognize value. He appreciates changes made to bring us to thins point and visions we have. There is a lot of work to do to collect data and information to use effectively to understand SROs, and staff are doing in context. Looking at all information to develop from students and their perceptions and from hard data from disciplinary interactions and data. We're going to be dealing with that in different ways and the Equity Committee may bring up issues and be specific about initiatives to address those specifically.
- Director Xiong also noted that she wanted to be clear truly appreciates work of SROs and program. Believe police officers do not have a role in education, and unfortunate we've come to a point where we must do this in order to maintain safety and security for our local school communities. She sees them and need them, and come together as a whole community to support and navigate and give resources to support students to achieve.
- She also added to the piece about data. She does appreciate the team for next steps and see feedback from students, SROs and administration. That's key and crucial. She also added more details and pushed further. She appreciated the MN student survey, it's important and useful and continue to use it to guide our work. Surveys 9th and 11th graders only, and we are a large school district to understand our student body. She looks forward to seeing this survey be available for all students in high school. She wants to see climate survey, and excited team to take the lead to define how that will look.

- Along with the incredible work that our SROs do, we are fortunate to have SROs to have great SROs who care and are passionate about students and to create initiatives to support and bring students. Examples were provided of initiatives.
- This work is also about people and many of our police officers and SROs live in the community and went to SPPS. We also need to have conversation about need for our SROs to humanize their work. In addition to that, she would also like to see two reports from SEM and to work in collaboration with the schools administrators and SROs – maybe introduction at beginning of school year and their work to create a positive climate for schools, and how to work together as a team to define that, and report at the end of year as reflection as to how that happened for the school year. We've been fortunate with SROs who get the work and enjoy working with kids and students, but every one and every SRO does it differently – on the board, love to hear the anecdotes and testimonies, and also important to have a report to understand how year has been across the board with all 7 SROs.
- She also asked that we follow-up on these 2 asks for SEM beginning with this SRO contract by proposing that we find time and directed staff.
- Director Xiong moved to come back in January with a resolution shared to direct administration to direct student climate survey and SRO report to the Board. She moved to approve the contract, and also recommend to come back in January to approve a resolution for the two proposals on the student climate survey and the SRO reports annually. It was noted by Chief Baker that the Board can give direction without a resolution, and come back to a future board meeting with the information requested. Chief Turner also clarified that we can with the Board's direction, can certainly put together a survey feedback plan to present to the Board with more details without a resolutions, but by the Board's directions, and is welcomed. Our next steps look differently at seeking feedback for students, and heard that the MN Student Survey should not be the only feedback that represents our student body. As a team, including with student climate team as SPPS achieves, climate, and one of the initiatives is and work we do around that in is in our strategic plan we are already doing work and we can move the timeline to present the plan to bring the SROs to talk at the beginning and end of year, love to put together as a team and work collaboratively with SPPD.
- There was further discussion on the contract, and amendment and direction to the superintendent to provide that information at a future meeting. Superintendent Gothard noted that we absolutely can do that. He also noted that it's important to note that 7 individuals are not responsible for all of school climate. – but it is all of us. All adults are responsible for meeting the needs of our students in the best way. Part of our strategic plan is a way to establish a regular way of measuring climate – with students being involved as well.
    - Director Xiong thanked him for his perspective, and reiterated that it is all our responsibility as community in ensuring to create school climate and environment that students need for well-rounded education. She rescinded her motion and moved to approve the contract.
- Director Brodrick noted he supports the recommendations to make the contract. Also would be ready and willing to second Director Xiong's two-part proposal after the contract is approved. Vice Chair Marchese also supported Director Xiong's requests.
- Director Vanderwert also encouraged Reflective Practice for SROs as they are dealing with some of the toughest situations in our schools, and all security folks could benefit from this training. It was very valuable the first time, and gives them other tools for the their toolkit outside their skills as police officers.
- Chair Ellis also added a few things. Every year we have this contract an every year it has become more expensive, and trying to gauge what we as a district believe about our kids and having SROs in our schools. We talk about safety and security and felt like when we came to this contract, what other options are being presented instead of SROs. The conversation started to shift last year. That does not mean this is the right thing – this is a decision thinking about for a long time to come because don't believe they belong in our school. She then shared her experiences in visiting high schools and with SROs, and conversations with them and our students how they felt and thought about having SROs. She saw in the interactions with SROs that they want to be in our buildings, and go through any training from this district to be in our schools with our kids and that speaks very well of them. Also felt warmth and connection between students and SROs and it was very relational. In talking about relationships with students from different schools and getting to know each other and build relationships, and that wouldn't happen without our current SROs and honor and respect work they're doing. We've talked about the money aspect, and 90/10 is not okay. The problem is that in

hearing from 7 individuals from buildings, they want to be there, and don't' feel like respected in own police department because they want to work with kids. It's the city's job to invest in them and in this partnership and front money for contract. It's important to add value to their work and that needs to come from the city. She has great respect for SROs in buildings, and had reflections and hard conversations and her experience and how they positively impact our students. She thanked the SROs. She urged our next Exec Committee to be in dialogue with SPPS with our mayor and figure out the new way forward. She is assuming that this contract will be more money, and sitting here having conversations, with more data, but still money piece of contract. 90/10 will never be good enough.

- Director Xiong and staff clarified the timeline for Administration to bring back a report on the next steps to student climate survey and reports from SRO.

BF 31891 Security and Emergency Management Vision SY20 and Beyond, and Agreement with City of St. Paul Police Department for Shared Costs of School Resource Officers (SROs)

MOTION: Ms. Xiong moved that the Board of Education consider and authorize the Chair and Clerk to execute an agreement with the City of St. Paul Police Department to provide School Resource Officers for services to the Saint Paul Public Schools for the term July 1, 2019 through June 30, 2020 in accordance with all terms and provisions of said agreement. The motion was seconded by Mr. Schumacher.

The motion was approved with the following roll call vote:

Ms. Ellis	Yes
Ms. Foster	Yes
Mr. Brodrick	Yes
Ms. Xiong	Yes
Ms. Vanderwert	Yes
Mr. Schumacher	Yes
Mr. Marchese	Yes

C. Action on Proposed Pay20 Levy

Marie Schrul, Chief Financial Officer, then provided a presentation on the Proposed Pay20 Levy to the Board of Education for final certification.

School Levy Basics

- School levy authority is established in law
- School budgets are a combination of state, federal and local funding, including the voter approved referendum
- Pay20 school levy funds the 2020-21 school year
- Districts receive payments after the May and October collections from the County
- Levy can only move down after October 1
- Pay20 Final Levy data is from MN Department of Education's Levy Limitation & Certification report as of 12/2/19

Pay20 Levy Calendar

- The dates and action of the Pay20 levy calendar were then reviewed.

Proposed Pay20 Levy

Levy Category	Certified Pay19 Levy	SPPS Proposed Pay20 Levy Ceiling	Difference
Operating	$ 71,112,468.34	$71,690,324.75	$577,856.41

Pension/OPEB/Contractual	39,544,457.62	37,860,071.32	(1,684,386.30)
Facilities	64,258,911.32	74,243,596.73	9,984,685.41
Community Service	3,779,160.32	3,685,753.77	56,593.45
Total - All Levy Categories	**$ 178,694,997.60**	**$187,629,746.57**	**$8,934,748.97**
Percent Change			5.0%

Estimated Annual Property Tax Impact | Home from 2019 to 2020
(assuming a 0% increase in market value)

- The estimated change at 5.0% was reviewed for homes at an estimated home market assuming a 0% increase in market value. At the median home market value of $199,800, the estimated change is $(47.28).

Estimated Annual Property Tax Impact | Home from 2019 to 2020
(assuming a 7.3% increase in market value)

- The estimated change at 5.0% was reviewed for homes at an estimated home market value assuming a 7.3% increase in market value. At the median home market value of $199,800, the estimated change is $36.10.

Estimated Annual Property Tax Impact | Commercial/Industrial from 2019 to 2020 (assuming a 6.0% increase in market value)

- The estimated change at 5.0% was reviewed for commercial/industrial properties at an estimated commercial/industrial market value assuming a 6.0% increase in market value. At the median commercial/industrial market value of $525,000, the estimated change is $(142.05)

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION: None

BF 31892 Action on Proposed Pay20 Levy

MOTION: Ms. Ellis moved approval of the recommendation to certify the Pay20 Levy in the amount of $187,629,746.57. The motion was seconded by Mr. Schumacher and Ms. Xiong.

The motion was approved with the following roll call vote:

Ms. Ellis	Yes
Ms. Foster	Absent
Mr. Brodrick	Yes
Ms. Xiong	Yes
Ms. Vanderwert	Yes
Mr. Schumacher	Yes
Mr. Marchese	Yes

XI. NEW BUSINESS

Chief Schrul introduced Kelly Smith, from Baker Tilly, to help present the three resolutions. These are to fund future and current projects. One being for the General Obligation bonds that we do annually for $15M, and opportunity do bond refunding for two of them, and discussed Certificates of Participation. Kelly smith also provided more information about the three items and resolutions.

A. Resolution Providing For The Competitive Sale Of $15,000,000 General Obligation School Building Bonds, Series 2020A

Kelly Smith provided more details that these are the annual issue the District has authority to issue of the maximum allowed. This would be for the 2020 calendar year, and would received funds in February, and are included on the levy.

BF 31856 Resolution Providing For The Competitive Sale Of $15,000,000 General Obligation School Building Bonds, Series 2020A

MOTION: Ms. Ellis moved approval of the Resolution Providing For The Competitive Sale Of $15,000,000 General Obligation School Building Bonds, Series 2020A. The motion was seconded by Mr. Schumacher.

The motion was approved with the following roll call vote:

Ms. Ellis	Yes
Ms. Foster	Absent
Mr. Brodrick	Yes
Ms. Xiong	Yes
Ms. Vanderwert	Yes
Mr. Schumacher	Yes
Mr. Marchese	Yes

B. Resolution Providing For The Competitive Sale Of $9,025,000 General Obligation Refunding Bonds, Series 2020B

More details were provided on the refunding bonds, which not many opportunities as change in refunding regulations. Had been doing advanced refunding and with tax law changes, no longer permitted and gap in bonds became callable. Small issues. 3% savings as guideline if makes sense to refund, and these are at 3%. In process of issuing other bonds, and with the rating call made financial sense to put issue forward, and receive 3% savings, around $300,000+, which is savings to the tax payers, because it will reduce future debt service payments on those bonds.

BF 31857 Resolution Providing For The Competitive Sale Of $9,025,000 General Obligation Refunding Bonds, Series 2020B

MOTION: Ms. Ellis moved approval of the Resolution Providing For The Competitive Sale Of $9,025,000 General Obligation Refunding Bonds, Series 2020B. The motion was seconded by Ms. Xiong.

The motion was approved with the following roll call vote:

Ms. Ellis	Yes
Ms. Foster	Absent
Mr. Brodrick	Yes
Ms. Xiong	Yes
Ms. Vanderwert	Yes
Mr. Schumacher	Yes
Mr. Marchese	Yes

C. Resolution Providing For The Competitive Sale Of $65,880,000 Certificates Of Participation, Series 2020C

BF 31858 Resolution Providing For The Competitive Sale Of $65,880,000 Certificates Of Participation, Series 2020C

This resolution written for receiving proceeds of $70M, and accessing dollars authorized by MDE approval of facilities projects, or portion of authorized amounts and for projects previously listed.

- The Board requested information on the timing and if it possible for us to do this at a later data, and the impact of that, and also question of having 2 separate ones, for lesser amount now, and remainder 2 months from now? Response: Yes, you could change this amount, however we have not been in a position where it has been changed mid-stream. The resolution written at that amount because of market conditions based on sale date. If you did want lesser amount, it would be possible to come back at later time and do remainder of $70M total. As it has bene mentioned, we are in a very good interest rate environment now. Currently, market conditions are favorable. It would be possible to split issues. For the $70M debt service schedule on levy approved as well. If determined only wanted to do portion, match debt schedule number for that revised number, which whatever is issued later to match debt service in levy. In terms of financing, could split issue, could qualify – need to do revised resolution at organizational meeting to make sure all numbers are correct. Resolutions are effectively giving Baker Tilly, as advisors, the go ahead to start setting sale in process to get official statements – the number could be adjusted.
- Further clarification on the question on $70M, and says $65.8M. we're in premium environment with bond sales, and interest rates at low point, investors will give premium for a bond. Investors will pay more for higher interest rate.

MOTION: Ms. Ellis moved approval of the Resolution Providing For The Competitive Sale Of $65,880,000 Certificates Of Participation, Series 2020C. The motion was seconded by Ms. Vanderwert.

The motion was approved with the following roll call vote:

Ms. Ellis	Yes
Ms. Foster	Absent
Mr. Brodrick	Yes
Ms. Xiong	Yes
Ms. Vanderwert	Yes
Mr. Schumacher	Yes
Mr. Marchese	No

D. Project Labor Agreements
1. Maxfield Elementary School Storefront & Flooring Replacement
2. Roof Replacements at Bridge View School, Dayton's Bluff Elementary School, Hubbs Center for Lifelong Learning, and LEAP High School
3. Window Replacements at Journeys Secondary School, Riverview West Side School of Excellence, Saint Paul Music Academy, and Paul & Sheila Wellstone Elementary School

BF 31893 Maxfield Elementary School Storefront & Flooring Replacement

MOTION: Ms. Ellis moved to approve the recommendation that a PLA is NOT used for the project of Maxfield Elementary School Storefront & Flooring Replacement. The motion was seconded by Ms. Vanderwert.

The motion was approved with the following roll call vote:

Ms. Ellis	Yes
Ms. Foster	Absent
Mr. Brodrick	Yes
Ms. Xiong	Yes
Ms. Vanderwert	Yes
Mr. Schumacher	Yes
Mr. Marchese	Yes

BF 31894 Roof Replacements at Bridge View School, Dayton's Bluff Elementary School, Hubbs Center for Lifelong Learning, and LEAP High School

Window Replacements at Journeys Secondary School, Riverview West Side School of Excellence, Saint Paul Music Academy, and Paul & Sheila Wellstone Elementary School

MOTION: **Ms. Ellis moved to approve the recommendation that a PLA is used for the projects of:**

- **Roof Replacements at Bridge View School, Dayton's Bluff Elementary School, Hubbs Center for Lifelong Learning, and LEAP High School, and**
- **Window Replacements at Journeys Secondary School, Riverview West Side School of Excellence, Saint Paul Music Academy, and Paul & Sheila Wellstone Elementary School.**

The motion was seconded by Ms. Xiong.

The motion was approved with the following roll call vote:

Ms. Ellis	Yes
Ms. Foster	Absent
Mr. Brodrick	Yes
Ms. Xiong	Yes
Ms. Vanderwert	Yes
Mr. Schumacher	Yes
Mr. Marchese	Yes

XII. BOARD OF EDUCATION

A. Information Requests & Responses

- Chair Ellis requested information given public comment, like to know how many interpreters we have in the district and the languages they speak. Also helpful to know how district kept hearing Jackson and Phalen are STRAND programming and what that means. Also learning more about the combining of two schools what that would mean and programming.
- She also requested information to know what our pay and credentials and experience for interpreters
- Somali language program, and Oromo and how many currently interpret and translate in multiple languages in district for all languages in the district.
- Director Foster noted Ethnic Studies update on work to date and next steps, and also demographics and breakdown via schools of SAT and PSAT.
- Director Xiong requested a SEAB update on their progress and an update on the disaggregation of data. That in relation to the charge of pilot school with MDE.
- Director Xiong also mentioned that to get better understanding of how many family liaisons work in school district and at which schools, and if they if schools are hiring different family liaisons to meet different needs of communities.

B. Items for Future Agendas

C. Board of Education Reports/Communications

- Director Vanderwerf provided a report and her thoughts on the last four years, including how it has been such a privilege to serve St. Paul and St. Paul's children over the last 4 years. It has been quite a ride with a lot of change and learning. She learned many things about education like how complex is our funding, how complex are our children with amazing talents and potential and how many challenges they have in their very young lives, how schools are expected to really attend to every aspect of a child's life and how committed our community is to our schools as evidenced by the positive referendum vote. SPPS will be forever in her heart. She recapped the accomplishments of the Board, leadership, mindset, culture, and challenges for the future to lead to a more external mindset. She is leaving SPPS with a full heart, great memories, admiration for all of the amazing work that is being done in our city and with prayers for the culture change that we desire. Wishing you all the external mindset necessary to make that very important change.

- Director Schumacher also shared in agreement with Director Vanderwert in terms of the pride feel of having served on this district. He reiterated point about vision, a district cares deeply about kids and families and his experience as a board member for the past four years, thanking the Superintendent, staff, families, students, and his board colleagues. There is a lot we've done and resolutions around gun safety and sanctuary schools, tobacco use, and we've taken care of small things and large things. It's important to remember things go on behind the scenes, with a hardworking and conscientious and collegial Board, and have deep respect for each other. The work of the board, and spend many more hours, doing other things and knowing district and doing best we can to make right decisions for the best education for all our students.

XIII. FUTURE MEETING SCHEDULE

A. Board of Education Meetings (6:05 unless otherwise noted)
- January 7, 2020 (Annual)
- January 21
- February 18
- March 24
- April 14
- May 19
- June 9 (Special – Non-Renewals)
- June 23
- July 21
- August 18

B. Committee of the Board Meetings (4:30 unless otherwise noted)
- January 7, 2020
- February 11
- March 10
- April 7
- May 5
- June 9
- August 5 (Wednesday)

MOTION: Ms. Ellis moved to schedule a Special Closed Meeting for the purpose of discussion of labor negotiation updates on Tuesday, January 21, 2020 beginning at 4:00pm in Conference Room 5A of 360 Colborne. The motion was seconded by Ms. Xiong.

The motion was approved with the following roll call vote:

Ms. Ellis	Yes
Ms. Foster	Absent
Mr. Brodrick	Yes
Ms. Xiong	Yes
Ms. Vanderwert	Yes
Mr. Schumacher	Yes
Mr. Marchese	Yes

XIV. ADJOURNMENT

Ms. Ellis moved the meeting to adjourn, and Mr. Schumacher seconded the motion. It passed by acclaim.

The meeting adjourned at 11:37 p.m.

For clarity and to facilitate research, these minutes reflect the order of the original Agenda and not necessarily the time during the meeting the items were discussed.

Prepared and submitted by

Sarah Dahlke
Assistant Clerk,
St. Paul Public Schools Board of Education