

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

**April 26, 2016**

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting was called to order at 6:39 p.m.

**II. ROLL CALL**

PRESENT: Mr. Marchese, Ms. Ellis, Mr. Brodrick, Mr. Vue, Ms. Vanderwert, Mr. Schumacher, Ms. O'Connell, Superintendent Silva, Ms. Cameron, General Counsel, Ms. Polsfuss, Assistant Clerk

**III. APPROVAL OF THE ORDER OF THE MAIN AGENDA**

**MOTION:** Ms. O'Connell moved approval of the Order of the Main Agenda. The motion was seconded by Ms. Vanderwert.

The motion was approved with the following roll call vote:

Mr. Marchese	Yes
Ms. Ellis	Yes
Mr. Brodrick	Yes
Mr. Vue	Yes
Ms. Vanderwert	Yes
Mr. Schumacher	Yes
Ms. O'Connell	Yes

**IV. RECOGNITIONS**

**BF 30415** Acknowledgement of Accomplishments of SPPS Students

**Fue Xiong**, a senior at **Central High School**, has been recognized for winning *Chipotle's Cultivating Thought* national essay contest. His 300-word essay is printed on the restaurant chain's cups and bags and earned him a \$20,000 scholarship. He has been accepted to the University of Minnesota College of Liberal Arts.

**BF 30416** Acknowledgement of Good Work Provided by Outstanding District Employees

1. The Minnesota Elementary School Principals' Association (MESPA) recognized **Catherine Rich**, principal of Phalen Lake Hmong Magnet, with the 2016 MESPA Division Leadership Achievement Award. The award honors principals whose exemplary leadership and sustained efforts have made noteworthy contributions to the operation of effective school learning programs — improving education, their communities, and their profession
2. The **Saint Paul Public Schools has received the Minnesota Department of Education 2016 School Finance Award**: The Minnesota Department of Education (MDE) released its list of school districts that received the 2016 School Finance Award, in which Saint Paul Public Schools made the list. Each year, MDE reviews each school district for criteria in the following areas: timely submission of financial data, compliance with MN statutes, presence of select indicators of fiscal health, and accuracy in financial reporting. The Finance team is pleased to share this great news with the Board, the District and the community.
3. The Fund for Teachers fellowships have been announced. These individuals and teams received a total of \$37,734 to undertake their fellowships. Congratulations to the following teachers: **Julie Elliott**, who will travel to Scotland to research how natural environments

impact art; **Brad Ollmann**, who will explore Latin dance and percussion in Mexico, Guatemala and Colombia; **See Vang, Leigh Vang** and **Kethkeo Vichaiyath**, who will research current living conditions of the Hmong people in Laos, Vietnam and Thailand; **Bethany McGraw** and **Charlotte Landreau**, who will explore the impacts of conflicts on indigenous groups in Thailand and Cambodia; **Charlotte Sivanich**, who will study mindfulness in Amsterdam and attend a math conference in Hungary; and **Amber Glawe**, who will travel to Guatemala to learn self control strategies for struggling learners and deepen her Spanish language proficiency.

The Fund for Teachers supports educators' efforts to develop skills, knowledge and confidence that impact student achievement. By trusting teachers to design unique fellowships, Fund for Teachers grants validate teachers' professionalism and leadership, as well. Since 2001, Fund for Teachers has invested \$22 million in nearly 6,000 teachers, transforming grants into growth for teachers and their students.

4. **Jesse Buetow**, a 5<sup>th</sup> grade teacher at **Randolph Heights**, was recently chosen for the 2016 Lead PBS LearningMedia Digital Innovator program. They choose one representative from each state. The PBS LearningMedia Digital Innovators program is a yearlong, free professional program designed to foster and reward a community of highly engaged, tech-savvy K-12 educators who are effectively using digital media and technology in classrooms to further student engagement and achievement. In addition to representing his state in Denver in June at the PBS Digital Summit and one day at the International Society for Technology Education Conference, he will be invited to join hundreds of Local Digital Innovators from across the country for exclusive access to all affiliated virtual events and trainings and the potential to partner with PBS in-person at specific education events back in our community.

**MOTION: Ms. O'Connell moved the Board of Education recognizes the students and staff acknowledged above for their contributions and outstanding work. Ms. Vanderwert seconded the motion.**

The motion was approved with the following roll call vote:

Mr. Marchese	Yes
Ms. Ellis	Yes
Mr. Brodrick	Yes
Mr. Vue	Yes
Ms. Vanderwert	Yes
Mr. Schumacher	Yes
Ms. O'Connell	Yes

## **V. APPROVAL OF THE ORDER OF THE CONSENT AGENDA**

**MOTION: Mr. Schumacher moved the Board of Education approve the Order of the Consent Agenda with the exception of Items B2 - Request for Permission to Submit a Grant Application to the City of Saint Paul Neighborhood STAR Grant and B6 – Request for Permission to Submit four Grant Applications to the Saint Anthony Park Community Foundation which were pulled for separate consideration. Motion was seconded by Ms O'Connell.**

The motion was approved with the following roll call vote:

Mr. Marchese	Yes
Ms. Ellis	Yes
Mr. Brodrick	Yes
Mr. Vue	Yes
Ms. Vanderwert	Yes
Mr. Schumacher	Yes
Ms. O'Connell	Yes

## **VI. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES**

A. Minutes of the Regular Meeting of the Board of Education of March 22, 2016

**MOTION: Mr. Brodrick moved the Board approve the Minutes of the Regular Meeting of the Board of Education of March 22, 2016 as published. The motion was seconded by Mr. Marchese.**

The motion was approved with the following roll call vote:

Mr. Marchese	Yes
Ms. Ellis	Yes
Mr. Brodrick	Yes
Mr. Vue	Yes
Ms. Vanderwert	Yes
Mr. Schumacher	Yes
Ms. O'Connell	Yes

**VII. COMMITTEE REPORTS**

A. Committee of the Board Meeting of April 12, 2016

At the April 12 Committee of the Board meeting there were two areas discussed: an FY 2016-17 Budget Update and an FMP Update. Both will be addressed again at this Board meeting. Actions made regarding these reports were:

**RECOMMENDED MOTION: That the Board accept the budget report.**

The motion was approved with the following roll call vote:

Mr. Marchese	Yes
Ms. Ellis	Yes
Mr. Brodrick	Yes
Mr. Vue	Yes
Ms. Vanderwert	Yes
Mr. Schumacher	Yes
Ms. O'Connell	Yes

and

**RECOMMENDED MOTION: That the Board approve the FMP report.**

The motion was approved with the following roll call vote:

Mr. Marchese	Yes
Ms. Ellis	Yes
Mr. Brodrick	Yes
Mr. Vue	Yes
Ms. Vanderwert	Yes
Mr. Schumacher	Yes
Ms. O'Connell	Yes

There was also a brief update on policies under review which will be coming to the Board.

**MOTION: Director Ellis moved acceptance of the report on the COB meeting of April 12, 2016 and approval of the minutes of the that meeting as published. Seconded by Ms. O'Connell.**

The motion was approved with the following roll call vote:

Mr. Marchese	Yes
Ms. Ellis	Yes
Mr. Brodrick	Yes
Mr. Vue	Yes
Ms. Vanderwert	Yes
Mr. Schumacher	Yes
Ms. O'Connell	Yes

## VIII. SUPERINTENDENT'S REPORT

### A. SSSC 2.0 Monitoring: Programs & Pathways

Staff provided the VisionCard Excellent PK-12 Programs with Connected Pathways. This card falls into the area of Alignment and overlooks four areas:

#### 1. School Readiness

- Childcare Partnerships - Vision is at least one in each area. Distribution of childcare providers using the SPPS early childhood workshop model ins SY 15-16 is Stable.
- Early Childhood Readiness Screening - Vision is 1,224. This is currently at Progress.
- Early Childhood Family Education Participation Proportionality ratio by race - Vision is >75%. American Indian is at 1.09, Asian at 0.70, Hispanic 1.22, Black 0.50 and White 1.69.

#### 2. Continued Enrollment

- Continued enrollment in SPPS - % of students staying enrolled across transition grades - Vision is >85%. PK to K 81% SY 15-16, 84% SY 14-15. 5 to 6 79% SY 15-16, 81% SY 14-15 and 8 to 9 83% SY 15-16, 84% SY 14-15.
- Continued enrollment in pathway - % of students staying enrolled across transition grades. Community 52% 5 to 6 and 70% 8 to 9. Specialized Programs: 60% 5 to 6 and 57% 8 to 9 (this was broken down further in the data via programs).

#### 3. School Choice

- On time Kindergarten applications (2016 School Choice Process) - % of total projected seats (including PK continuing to K). Vision if >70%. This area is at Vision with 94% in 2015 and 2016.
- Kindergarten Choice - % of families applying in 2016 that received first or second choice school for Kindergarten. Vision is >85%. This is at Vision with 86% (down from 89% in 2015). 80% received their first choice, 6% their second choice.

1,228 Family Feedback Exit Surveys were sent out in Quarters 1 and 2. 80 responses have been received back as of 4/16/16.

#### 4. Out of School Learning

- Percent of SPPS students participating in Sprockets activities in SY 14-15 is at 44%, up from 41% in SY 13-14.
- Attendance rate of students enrolled in Extended Day Learning (K-12) in SY 14-15 is 43%, down from 76% in SY 13-14.
- Attendance rate of students enrolled in S Term (K-12) in Summer 2015. Vision is >80%. This is at Vision with 95%, up from 83% for Summer 2014.

The metric spotlighted from the Programs and Pathways VisionCard was Early Childhood Readiness Screening. During last school year, 1,015 three-year olds were screened. this is a 22% increase from the previous school year. SPPS is targeting three-year olds because the earlier SPPS is able to identify and address concern areas for children, the better prepared they will be for Kindergarten.

Screenings are important and required. They review: height and weight, vision and hearing, health and immunization information, social/emotional areas, speech and other developmental concerns. The screenings are done by several different groups: Early Childhood Family Education, Early Childhood Special Education, Office of Early Learning (Pre-K), Student Health & Wellness and community members and programs making Readiness for Kindergarten a truly collaborative process.

Several practices have been improved within early childhood screening in collaboration with Generation Next:

#### 1. Greater collaboration

- a process map has been developed as part of United Way Women's Giving Grant that has helped clarify roles and define work flow.
  - The group (which includes ECFE, ECSE, OEL, Student Health & Wellness) now meet together on a regular basis
  - This is being done in order to screen more children even while SPPS has fewer resources.
2. There have been equipment upgrades
  3. Data system supports have been improved so that now when children are screened, there is an electronic health record uploaded to Campus. This is important because it allows SPPS to collect and report more accurate data on who has been screened and who has been missed. This has been a collaborative effort between REA, Technology Services and OTL.
  4. SPPS is always looking for additional ways to get into the community to screen children. It already screens at 19 city childcare centers, community events such as the Mr. Roger's event, Meet Your Neighbor and the School Choice Fair.

#### QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:

- What happens after screening if a child is identified with special needs? Response: When a child does not pass a particular part of the screening the child is referred to Special Ed or to a health care provider for follow-up on the area(s) of concern. Adults are also referred to ECFE and early learning.
- Head Start screens all 3 and 4 year olds in its programs. The data is complicated to share and SPPS and Head Start are working with United Way to find a way to integrate records.

School Choice Season 2016 was the other area highlighted. The Chief Engagement Officer reviewed the Admissions Priority chart with Board members so they were aware of how priorities are assigned to enrollments. Admission priorities are to keep families together, encourage enrollment in their community school and maintaining school choice.

The 2016 Lottery was completed March 31st. There were 6,245 on-time participants, 2,616 reserved seats and 1,260 late applications of which 737 have been placed. For the Kindergarten Lottery there were 1,772 participants (on time and late). 79% of the students placed received their first choice, 86% of the students were placed; 256 were not able to be placed because their schools of choice were full. The majority applied for six schools (St. Anthony Park, JJ Hill, Randolph Heights, Expo, Nokomis North and Horace Mann).

The Grade 1-12 lottery had 4,086 students participating. 60% received their first or second choice school. 2,616 reserved seats were utilized..

The Continued Enrollment in SPPS - % of students staying enrolled across transition grades showed the following results for 2015-16. PreK to K 81% (84% in 14-15), Fifth to Sixth Grad 79% (81% in 14-15) and Eight to Ninth 83% (84% in 14-15). Vision level is >85%. Staff presented a chart showing Continued Enrollment in Pathways - % of students staying enrolled across transition grades. Data was broken out into Community schools 5 to 6 and 8 to 9 and Specialized Programs 5 to 6 and 8 to 9.

PreK had 1,647 students enrolled, 77% of them were placed leaving 371 students on the waiting list.

Schools with waiting lists with the most significant numbers are JJ Hill (107), St. Anthony Park (89), Nokomis (111), Capitol Hill (473), Farnsworth (66), Highland Park Middle (118), Open (137), Central (114), Washington (262) and Highland Park Senior (118). If a family wants to maximize the possibility of their student attending school with the same classmates from K-12 they should consider the recommended Community School Pathway (the natural pathway for students to take if they want to attend school in their general community or neighborhood.)

Reflecting St. Paul was established to help integrate schools. Schools that are at 20% or below the district poverty average are the schools qualifying for this program. Schools requested with no available seats were: Capitol Hill, Chelsea, Expo, Groveland, Horace Mann, Jie Ming, JJ Hill, L'Etoile, Randolph Heights and St. Anthony Park. There were 296 available seats, 209 applicants, 120 were placed with 42% of seats filled (last year there were 325 seats and 98% were filled). Placement will hold seats releasing some to be filled in June and additional seats in August. Held seats are 25% of available seats at grade level after siblings are placed and families within the community assigned.

Placement has 500+ late applications they are working on. Phone calls are being made to the applicants and site-based outreach is being done. There are also 40 additional Kindergarten applications. The District will continue to manage incoming applications; those on the waiting list, walk-ins, online and paper applications on an on-going basis.

#### QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION

- What was the process for middle and high school? Response: SPPS conducted a survey and parents and staff did not feel the School Choice Fair model fit at the secondary level. Families want more in-depth information about and experience of secondary school sites. Schools are now offering open houses so families and their students can see and experience the school site as they make their decisions.
- So, compared to last year did, more students and families show up? Response: Student Placement and high school staff were at all open houses to address questions and offer information. There was improvement in overall attendance. Middle and high school principals felt the open houses were a benefit for showing off the school sites and their offerings.
- What is the retention mark being aimed for? Response: Around 80%. SPPS still loses about 20% at transitions.
- Concern was expressed about the 20% going somewhere else. Why are students leaving? Response: The Waiting List tells us that if every family could get into their school of choice they would stay in the district. The "in demand" schools need to be able to increase supply at their sites, that would increase retention rates (Highland, Open, Washington, etc). Unfortunately most of the "in demand" sites are at full capacity.
- A Board member commented the SSSC was designed to offer excellent options across the city. It appears SPPS cannot accommodate demand unless it brings other programs and schools to that "in demand" level making those schools places where families want their students to go. We need to increase capacity/desirability in schools beyond those in high demand. Response: When a district has the school choice process in place there is choice. The District can build programs and offerings equal to other schools but ultimately it is the parent's choice. SPPS is monitoring whether students, after they have chosen a program, are staying with the pathways chosen. It is not about numbers entirely, SPPS rates of retention are higher than most systems with choice offerings. Market share is not going to change, parents who typically choose private and parochial will continue to do so. The change occurs between public and charter. The biggest area of growth is at the earlier grades when families enter the system. Many factors influence choices and SPPS does make an effort to encourage families but ultimately it is the parents who choose the program.
- How can SPPS build programs from successful programs to keep students within the district and not go outside. Response: Parents are always evaluating other options available, it is an annual, on-going process.
- Concern was expressed that the Board is not seeing increasing enrollment. Families are making other choices, what are they and why. How and what can be integrated into programs to capture more families? Response: The SSSC is based on addressing that. Immersion and magnet program were created to address desires for programs. Regional magnets were developed because of demand. SPPS is now in the process of gathering feedback as families transition out of the district to try to pinpoint specific reasons why they are leaving.
- Does SPPS understand why Kindergarten parents feel they have to be in the in demand schools, what are they looking for? Response: SPPS does everything it can to

encourage parents to consider other options. Academics, achievement, demographics (an environment where the child looks like others) is what families want to feel welcome. Start time and close to home are other factors. Families that support diverse schools tend to choose magnet schools. SPPS can use all the tools it has available to create environments but not all sites get the number of students they need to continue a program and then again some programs can be redesigned into very successful programs. Parents also decide on other factors such as reputation, academic results and concentration of poverty.

- All SPPS schools have made progress, there have been some amazing changes (ie. Washington) and the FMP is a part of this as well offering better facilities. Recognizing there are many factors why schools are chosen and given all the conversations around the city, SPPS still has good retention rates – parents see the schools are working. A lot of things have been put in place to improve things over the past few years.
- There is still some inequity within the district as well. SPPS has been trying to get high poverty families to attend SPPS schools, is that goal being achieved? How have the schools been marketed to families so SPPS can take advantage of opportunities? Response: Reflecting St. Paul numbers were high last year (325 seats honored, 95%). As capacity changes within identified schools some come off the list as their diversity increases. Highland elementary came off this year as it now has diversity. Families that did not come in early will not miss an opportunity to be part of Reflecting St. Paul as SPPS is holding seats to accommodate late comers.
- Staff commented, in a choice system, St Paul led the way in the country in terms of offering good choices. Concern was expressed about helping struggling schools to be schools of choice for their community. SPPS has taken schools and built them up to improve their reputation and we want to be sure to continue to do that, helping struggling schools to be stronger. Much of a school's reputation is based on perceptions which may not be accurate. There is a need to give schools time and assistance to change perceptions about the school, that will make the community stronger as well.
- Does SPPS have adequate capacity? Has class size ranges impacted capacity for waiting lists? Response: Yes. As an example, modifying class sizes at Expo which has six sections of kindergarten, the class size reduction was 4. Times that by 6 resulted in 24 fewer seats at Expo for Kindergarten. It has definitely had an impact at the schools.
- Does SPPS have capacity to accommodate all students in the city that might come in? Response: Yes Capacity in the right schools? Maybe - SPPS needs to make every school the right school, make all schools schools of choice. Currently there is a mismatch of where families want to go and where seats are available.
- Concern was expressed about looking at options in Area E, the over subscription at one school and under capacity at another that exists within Area E. A Board member suggested involving the community in Area E to enable staff, community, administration to collectively look at options in the total area and use this as a chance to engage, to learn what is working, what is not, about concerns and having enough stakeholders to use this as a planning process to find where to go with options in that area. The question was asked, does that sound feasible? Can that be done to expand the reach within the community? Response: I like the idea but not in only in the one area, we would need to formalize the concept across all areas. That would allow the different areas to decide what are the most important areas to work on together. A Board member stated class size is important to student learning, she hoped for more one to one with teachers. She went on to say she liked having conversations about schools within the areas - what do parents want, communities might value having the opportunity to have larger conversations around that. It was suggested that a couple Board members and some staff plan/explore around the idea, flesh it out more and bring it back to the COB in June.
- Another Board member stated SPPS needs to see how best to make neighborhood schools attractive to their neighborhood community.
- A Board member stated there is a need to get clarity around Galtier and Hamline that is based on data and trends within that area, enrollment loss and gain and the impact. Staff indicated they had isolated Galtier and Hamline based on their proximity and issues within those two schools.

- Communities want to have strong schools in their neighborhood.
- A Board member stated he liked the idea of looking at areas citywide but the process needs more development before moving forward. The Superintendent could work with staff to flesh out next steps. Response: Administration is always open to explore other possibilities. The Superintendent noted that maintaining a small school means SPPS has to have a minimum amount of money to make the school viable and that means funding is taken away from other schools. It is a decision the Board needs to make soon on how they want the dollars allocated and to consider ways for area involvement along with Galtier issues.
- A Board member suggested Board members and staff work to bring ideas to a COB on how and where to start. Reporting at the June COB was suggested. Director Marchese expressed willingness to work with the Chief Engagement Officer to flesh out an area wide planning process to be implemented down the road. Enrollment options, analyze data, etc.
- Staff indicated SPPS will continue to move forward with Hamline and Galtier conversations. May 19 is the next meeting.
- A Board member stated SPPS needs to promote all SPPS schools.

**B. FY 17 Budget Update**

The CFO indicated the purpose of the presentation was to provide an update to the Board on the FY 2016-17 General Fund budget. She reviewed the SSSC 2.0 goals and focus areas along with the 2016-17 budget guidelines.

The FY 2016-17 General Fund revenue is projected to decrease by \$4.6 million (Comp Ed and Enrollment). The budget meets required contractual obligations. All school do not receive the same amount of money per pupil because some school funding is categorical (it has specific criteria on its spending), funding for CompEd and Title I follow the students on a one year delay (previous year's October 1 count) and higher poverty schools have greater access to categorical dollars than lower poverty sites. School enrollment affects the dollars allocated.

Other influencing factors include third quarter projections that impact fiscal year end fund balance, enrollment fluctuations impact revenue, class size and building capacity, contractual settlements impact expenditure levels, legislative adjustments impact revenue, previous year's October 1 free and reduced lunch count impacts revenue, and bond ratings have an impact on financing and interest rates.

**FY 2016-17 General Fund Preliminary Big Picture (in millions)**

	<b>FY 16 Adopted Budget</b>	<b>FY 17 Preliminary</b>	<b>Difference</b>	<b>% Change</b>
Revenue	\$522.8	\$518.2	(\$4.6)	(0.88%)
Use of Fund Balance	2.5	0	(2.5)	(100.0%)
Expenditures	525.3	533.3	(8.0)	(1.50%)
Balance	\$0	(\$15.1)		

**FY 2016-17 General Fund Factors Impacting Shortfall**

<b>Item</b>	<b>Amount (\$M)</b>
Projected Shortfall (as of 1/19/16)	(\$9.3)
Contractual Commitments	(3.5)
Compensatory Revenue Decrease	(1.1)
Gen Ed Revenue Decrease (2/29 Projected Enrollment)	(1.2)
<b>Total Shortfall</b>	<b>(\$15.1)</b>

**FY 17 PROPOSED GENERAL FUND BIG PICTURE - EXPENDITURES**

<b>Area</b>	<b>FY 16 Adopted</b>	<b>FY 17 Proposed</b>	<b>Change</b>	<b>% Change</b>
Schools	\$253,330,183	\$247,708,812	(\$5,621,371)	(2.2%)



School Service Support	175,987,186	178,608,557	2,098,371	1.2%
District-wide Support	91,793,916	88,691,572	(3,102,344)	(3.4%)
Central Admin	4,154,590	3,694,499	(460,091)	(11.1%)
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$525,265,875</b>	<b>\$518,180,440</b>		

**FY 17 Proposed General Fund Budget Reductions of Central Admin Programs**

<b>Program Category</b>	<b>FY 16 Adopted</b>	<b>FY 17 Proposed</b>	<b>Reduction Amount</b>	<b>Reduct. %</b>	<b>Inflation Amt. Not Allocated</b>	<b>% Total Reduct.</b>
Central Admin	\$4,154,590	\$3,694,499	(\$460,091)	(11.1%)	(\$73,742)	(12.8%)

- Board of Education
- Superintendent's Office
- CEO
- CAO
- Chief of Operations of Engagement
- General Counsel
- Office of Elementary & Secondary Education
- Chief

**FY 17 Proposed General Fund Budget Reductions of District-wide Support Programs**

<b>Program Category</b>	<b>FY 16 Adopted</b>	<b>FY 17 Proposed</b>	<b>Reduction Amount</b>	<b>Reduct. %</b>	<b>Inflation Amt. Not Allocated</b>	<b>% Total Reduct.</b>
District-wide Support	\$91,793,916	\$88,691,572	(\$3,102,344)	(3.4%)	(\$1,311,404)	(4.8%)

- Finance
- Enterprise Resource Planning
- Office of Equity
- Out for Equity
- Multicultural Resource Center
- Family & Community Engagement
- Communications
- MIS
- HR
- Research & Evaluation
- Referendum Technology
- Technology Infrastructure
- Operations & Maintenance
- Grounds
- Custodial
- Safety & Security
- Facility Planning/Leases/Health & Safety
- Employee Benefits
- Insurance
- Utilities

**FY 17 Proposed General Fund Budget Reductions of School Service Support Programs**

<b>Program Category</b>	<b>FY 16 Adopted</b>	<b>FY 17 Proposed</b>	<b>Reduction Amount</b>	<b>Reduct. %</b>	<b>Inflation Amt. Not Allocated</b>	<b>% Total Reduct.</b>
School Service Support	\$175,987,186	\$178,085,557	\$2,098,371	(1.2%)	(\$2,678,069)	(0.01%)

- Student Placement
- Indian Ed
- Valley Branch
- Am. Indian Studies
- TDAS
- MLL
- Substitutes
- Athletics
- Pre-K Support
- Referendum Family Ed
- School to Work
- Special Ed
- 3rd Party Reimbursement
- Instructional Services
- Staff Development
- Leadership Development

- Achievement Plus
- Career in Education
- Counseling/Guidance
- OCCR
- Student Wellness
- Attendance Action Ctr
- Alt to Suspension
- Transportation
- Referendum - PLTT
- Peer Assistance/Review

**FY 17 General Fund Recommendations to Address Projected Shortfall of \$15.1 million**

<u>Description</u>	<u>Amount</u>
Eliminating the proposed 2017 contribution to OPEB Trust	1.0
No annual inflationary increases for departments	4.1
Eliminating job-embedded PD at <b>non-priority elementary, K-8 and 6-8 sites</b>	7.5
Targeted departmental and central admin staff & program adjustments	2.7
Offering an early retirement incentive	0
Total	\$15.3

**FY 17 Additional Allocation to Sites - \$3.0 million**

<u>Description</u>	<u>Amount</u>
Additional reduction of 1% across department budgets	(\$1.4)
Early use of Fall adjustment funding	(1.6)
Total	\$3.0
Additional allocation to sites to address funding challenges with specialized programs and class sizes	3.00
Total	\$0

The CFO then moved on to a review of staffing of the schools (funding for SSSC 2.0).

**SSSC 2.0 Class Size Ranges for Higher Poverty Sites**

<u>Grade</u>	<u>FY 17 Target Ranges</u>
PreK 20	
KG	20-24
1-3	22-25
4-5	25-28
6-8	29-33
9-12	30-35

**SSSC 2.0 Class Size Ranges for Lower Poverty Sites**

<u>Grade</u>	<u>FY 17 Target Ranges</u>
PreK 20	
KG	22-26
1-3	22-27
4-5	25-29
6-8	29-35
9-12	30-37

FY 2016-17 Site staffing criteria (a few additional categories were added to the staffing categories – psychologist, MLL teachers and SSSC site staff for program articulation).

<u>Site Configurations</u>	<u>Staffing Categories</u>
Pre-K - 5 Principal	
K - 8	Assistant Principal
Dual Campus	Administrative Intern
6 - 8	Teachers
6 - 12	Clerks
9 - 12	Counselors
	Library Media Specialists
	Nurses

Social Workers  
Psychologists  
MLL Teachers  
Library Support (EA or TA)  
SSSC 2.0 Site Staff for Program Articulation

All staffing categories are based on established criteria for each school. Schools also receive a non-salary amount for supplies and an extra-curricular allocation depending on what kind of site they are.

The CFO then reviewed the budget adoption calendar and the schedule for community engagement meetings. She noted April 29 is a hard deadline for HR as most contracts have a May 1 communication date for layoffs, etc. It is also necessary in order to align staffing for the following year.

#### QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION

- The CFO stated there was a perception that if the funding is not put into OPEB retirees would not receive their benefits. She stated OPEB and benefits are unrelated issues, health benefits are not going away.
- The School Service budget increase – is every other department making cuts to allow for transportation? Response: Yes. Transportation costs have increased state-wide and are impacting most school districts. All other budgets have received reductions and inflationary reductions across the board. There is about a \$2.1 million increase for transportation balanced by the inflation reduction of \$2.6 million.
- A Board member asked if there was any other way to achieve the \$7.5 reduction in job embedded PD. What impact will the reduction have on programs? Response: For the past four years SPPS has been able to provide an additional 50 minutes of time during the day for teachers to have PD during the day, it is best practice. In elementary this added additional science prep/specialists plus 50 minutes of PLC time. Most schools have now added science into their rotation – art/music, phy. ed. and science, some with theater, dance. It will be a reduction in staffing.
- A Board member stated he was concerned about the \$7.5 reduction for job-embedded PD at non-priority elementary, K-8 and 6-8 sites being a reduction borne by the schools. It seems contrary to where SPPS is trying to concentrate resources. He felt Administration may have to go into the admin budgets more deeply to get this amount. Response: Staff indicated job embedded PD, specialty classes and electives have been going on for a long time and schools are putting funding toward support specialists and electives.
- SPPS is facing hard times and needs to choose its priorities to be sure teachers get what they need. Administration stated it was not in favor of reducing admin further. To have a successful district strong leaders are needed so there is a definite need to retain strong leaders particularly in addressing the achievement issue. As far as the budget reduction recommendation on job embedded PD, SPPS is one of the only districts in the state that currently provides job embedded PD in way it is done here. Other districts utilize Title I or QComp resources. Job embed PD was directly tied to providing specialists in science – increasing science instruction. Provision of specialists and electives was being done prior to job-embedded PD and will continue to be. The amount of time for science instruction, art and music in rotation may change but it will still be there. The budget commits to contractual obligations such as class size, additional staffing (counselors, nurses, librarians, etc); all those come with a cost. PD was the only cut not related to enrollment or contractual obligation associated with the budget. PD is a luxury SPPS cannot afford at this time and added reductions elsewhere would impact contractual items. The SPPS budget is mostly personnel costs.
- The original idea of job-embedded PD tied to electives was a way to implement it. When Administration did not cut it last year, the cost was a loss of a lot of support staff. Schools will not be losing all electives, there will be a scaling back of electives but adding additional support staff. SPPS has also added \$3 million to offset the worst of \$7.5

reduction so that amount is mitigated to some degree. It has come to the point of the least worst decisions in regard to the budget.

- The chair noted SPPS will have to think about what do this year and how it will shape what happens next year. It needs to consider how to deliver the kind of education kids need in ways that are sustainable. This budget is part of an on-going process.
- Staff/personnel is 86% of the SPPS budget, Administrative staff is critical to the functioning of the district and needs to be maintained at a functional level. Staff noted SPPS is the largest employer in the City of St. Paul.
- A director noted SPPS needs to be sure the community understands that in a district this large administration is being cut but must not be cut to a point where it is not longer functional.
- What does the Board need to get their job done? They were elected to make the hard decisions for the entire district. Do we need additional community meetings for input? What does the Board need to feel comfortable in what needs to be done. Feedback on process as it moves into the future? Another Board member stated people may not see the bigger picture affecting the entire district, just their own little piece of it. There has been a lot of input on the budget in general over the past months (and years), there does not seem to be any benefit of having more input sessions right now. The Board needs to make the hard decisions. Input from community is important coming into process but the budget is at the point now where additional input might not be helpful. The Board will need to discuss how the process might be done differently next year however.
- The Superintendent stated probably the most beneficial thing the Board, staff and the community can do now is to advocate with their legislative representatives to use the State surplus to benefit the children of Minnesota's education. Every school district in the state needs funding to continue their educational efforts.

#### C. Human Resource Transactions

**MOTION:** Ms. O'Connell moved approval of the Human Resource Transactions for the period March 1, 2016 through March 31, 2016. Mr. Marchese seconded the motion.

The motion was approved with the following roll call vote:

Mr. Marchese	Yes
Ms. Ellis	Yes
Mr. Brodrick	Yes
Mr. Vue	Yes
Ms. Vanderwert	Yes
Mr. Schumacher	Yes
Ms. O'Connell	Yes

#### IX. CONSENT AGENDA

**MOTION:** Ms. O'Connell moved the Board of Education approve all items on the Consent Agenda with the exception of Items B2 - Request for Permission to Submit a Grant Application to the City of Saint Paul Neighborhood STAR Grant and B6 - Request for Permission to Submit four Grant Applications to the Saint Anthony Park Community Foundation which were pulled for separate consideration. The motion was seconded by Mr. Marchese.

The motion was approved with the following roll call vote:

Mr. Marchese	Yes
Ms. Ellis	Yes
Mr. Brodrick	Yes
Mr. Vue	Yes
Ms. Vanderwert	Yes
Mr. Schumacher	Yes
Ms. O'Connell	Yes

A. Gifts - None

B. Grants

**BF 30417** Request for Permission to Accept a Grant from the CenturyLink Clark M. Williams Foundation

That the Board of Education authorize the Superintendent (designee) to accept a grant from the CenturyLink Clark M. Williams Foundation to purchase a laser cutter at Crossroads; and to implement the project as specified in the award documents.

**BF 30418** Request for Permission to Submit a Grant Application to the Jeffers Foundation

That the Board of Education authorize the Superintendent (designee) to submit a grant to the Jeffers Foundation for funds to create a pollinator garden at Belwin Outdoor Science; to accept funds, if awarded; and to implement the project as specified in the award documents.

**BF 30419** Request for Permission to Submit a Grant Application to the Minnesota Department of Education's Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Program

That the Board of Education authorize the Superintendent (designee) to submit a grant to the Minnesota Department of Education's Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Program for funds to provide fresh fruit and vegetables in the district; to accept funds, if awarded; and to implement the project as specified in the award documents.

**BF 30420** Request for Permission to Submit a Grant Application to the National Environmental Education Foundation

That the Board of Education authorize the Superintendent (designee) to submit a grant to the National Environmental Education Foundation for funds to create an ecology curriculum at Belwin Outdoor Science; to accept funds, if awarded; and to implement the project as specified in the award documents.

**BF30421** Request for Permission to Accept a Grant from the Whole Kids Foundation

That the Board of Education authorize the Superintendent (designee) to accept a grant from the Whole Kids Foundation to expand and improve the school garden at Crossroads Elementary School; and to implement the project as specified in the award documents.

C. Contracts

**BF30422** Authorization for Amendment to the Contract with Public Consulting Group, Inc.

That the Board of Education authorize the Superintendent (designee) to approve this Amendment to the contract with Public Consulting Group, Inc. for the services in accordance with the terms and conditions of Amendment for as long as the services support the district's application infrastructure and systems.

D. Agreements - None

E. Administrative Items

**BF 30423** Children's Defense Fund Freedom Schools 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 CDF Freedom Schools Summer Term.

**BF30424** Approval of Employment Agreement Between Independent School District No. 625, Saint Paul Public Schools, and Saint Paul Federation of Teachers, Exclusive Representative for Educational Assistants

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 educational assistant employees in this District for whom the Saint Paul Federation of Teachers is the

exclusive representative; duration of said Agreement is for the period of July 1, 2013 through June 30, 2015.

**BF 30425** 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 April 30, 2016, should they not comply with Minnesota State Health Standards for Immunizations on or before this date.

**BF 30426** Facilities Department FY16 Purchases/Change Orders over \$100,000

That the Board of Education authorize the purchases listed for the Facilities Department anticipated to be over the \$100,000.

**BF 30427** Monthly Operating Authority

That the Board of Education approve and ratify the following checks and wire transfers for the period February 1, 2016 – February 29, 2016.

General Account	#654688-656265	\$46,620,088.25
	#0001828-0001878	
	#7001626-7001677	
	#0000951-0000997	

(a) Debt Service	-0-	\$0.00
------------------	-----	--------

(b) Construction	-0-	\$1,081,277.28
------------------	-----	----------------

\$47,701,365.53

*Included in the above disbursements are payrolls in the amount of \$36,740,608.04 and overtime of \$162,215.45 or 0.44% 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 July 31, 2016.

F. Bids

**BF 30428** Bid No. A209050-A Transforming Central Sitework Project

That the Board of Education authorize award of Bid No. A209050-A Transforming Central Sitework Project to LS Black for the lump sum base bid plus alternates no. 1,3,5,6 & 8 for \$369,953.00.

**BF 30429** Bid No. A209059-A Central Griffin Stadium Repair

That the Board of Education authorize award of Bid No. A209059-A Central Griffin Stadium Repair to Innovative Masonry Restoration, LLC for the lump sum base bid plus alternate no. 2 for \$1,184,000.00.

**BF 30430** Bid No. A209277-A Toilet Partition Replacement at Various Schools

That the Board of Education authorize award of Bid No. A209277-A Toilet Partition Replacement at Various Schools to Iyawe & Associates for the lump sum base bid plus alternate no. 1 for \$135,000.00.

**BF 30431** Bid No. A209292-A Johnson Aerospace High School Renewal

That the Board of Education authorize award of Bid No. A209292-A Johnson Aerospace High School Renewal to Corval for the lump sum base bid plus alternate nos. 1,2,5 & 6 for \$15,071,092.00.

**BF 30432** Bid No. A209302-A Humboldt Secondary Campus Tennis Court Rehabilitation

That the Board of Education authorize award of Bid No. A209302-A Humboldt Secondary Campus Tennis Court Rehabilitation to Bituminous Roadways for the lump sum base bid for \$215,635.00.

**IX. CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS PULLED FOR SEPARATE CONSIDERATION**

The Board Chair recused himself from both of the pulled items as he is involved with the organizations. He indicated the two items could be moved together.

**BF30433** Request for Permission to Submit a Grant Application to the City of Saint Paul Neighborhood STAR Grant

**BF30434** Request for Permission to Submit four Grant Applications to the Saint Anthony Park Community Foundation

Director O'Connell offered Board recognition to the groups and individuals involved in fund raising for the exterior renovations being planned for Central High School.

**MOTION: Mr. Schumacher moved the Board of Education authorize the Superintendent (designee) to submit a grant to the City of Saint Paul Neighborhood STAR Grant for funds to make exterior renovations at Central High School; to accept funds, if awarded; and to implement the project as specified in the award documents; and that the Board of Education authorize the Superintendent (designee) to submit a grant to the Saint Anthony Park Community Foundation for funds to subsidize a band field trip and administer a tutoring program at Murray Middle School; to accept funds, if awarded; and to implement the project as specified in the award documents. The motion was seconded by Ms. O'Connell.**

The motion was approved with the following roll call vote:

Mr. Marchese	Yes
Ms. Ellis	Yes
Mr. Brodrick	Yes
Mr. Vue	Yes
Ms. Vanderwert	Yes
Mr. Schumacher	Recused Himself
Ms. O'Connell	Yes

**X. OLD BUSINESS - None**

**XI. NEW BUSINESS**

**A. Facilities Master Plan Update**

The Director of Facilities provided a brief review of the FMP process stating it was a 10-year strategic plan that addresses facility improvements equitably, efficiently and cost-effectively. It is student-centered and addresses 21st century learning needs.

The FMP 5-year implementation plan is based off of Board resolutions passed in November and December of 2015.

- Five-Year Facilities Maintenance and Capital Implementation Plan
- Long-Term Facilities Maintenance and Improvement Investments
- Criteria for the Prioritization of Facility Improvements for SPPS, District 625, to Create 21st Century Schools.

The Plan covers FY 2017 through 2021 and will be updated every year with the assistance of the FMP Committee. It sets strategic direction but does not provide funding. Actions taken at this meeting will adopt the five-year implementation plan and the list of proposed school facility work scopes. Actions that will occur in August will determine the financial commitment to the 5-year plan: levy amount set for FY 2018, levy ceiling includes more than just facilities, bonds sold in May; levy process is September thru December. In April of 2017 the Board will be asked to review and approve the next 5-year rolling facility plan.

The total facilities investment for 2017-2021 is approximately \$484 million and includes new construction, major repair/replacement, abatement and renovation.

SPPS has two funding options: (1) Pay-As-You-Go using Long Term Facilities Revenue (LTFR) - levy and (2) issue General Obligation Bonds and Certificates of Participation - levy. SPPS has special legislative bonding authority which was granted by the legislature in 1989. SPPS can issue bonds without voter approval which it has conservatively done since. SPPS is anticipating using both funding options of continuing LTFM revenue (facilities levy) with GO bonds and Certificates of Participation (debt levy). SPPS will be very conscious of the timing of the funding and the taxpayer impact.

Building construction funds are used to maintain, improve, remodel buildings and land. By law, they cannot be used for other funding categories. Increases to the Building Construction Funds do not decrease the General Fund. Building Construction Funds are funds from bond sales, capital loans or Long Term Facilities Maintenance Revenue (including levies). SPPS has used bonds every year since 1994 to pay for facilities.

Next steps involve communications and engagement such as:

- FMP website as a clearinghouse for information regarding the FMP process
- May-June meetings with the Mayor, District Councils, PACs
- Start new middle school design planning and engagement efforts
- Development of project-specific communications (started six months ahead of design process)
- Working with regulatory agencies, city, county, watershed districts, etc.
- March-April 2017 reconvene FMP Committee to review rolling 5-year plan and update as necessary per criteria.

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:

- Any progress on finding a place for River East? Response: Not at this point.

**BF 30435** Motion Regarding Jie Ming and River East

**MOTION:** Ms. O'Connell moved the Board of Education approve (a) Saint Paul Public Schools relocating the River East Elementary and Secondary program from the Homecroft building, at 1845 Sheridan Ave, to another suitable site by the start of the 2017-2018 school year, and (b) That Saint Paul Public Schools relocate Jie Ming Mandarin Immersion Academy from the Hamline Elementary building, at 1599 Englewood Ave., to the Homecroft building, at 1845 Sheridan Ave, beginning with the 2017-2018 school year. Ms. Vanderwert seconded the motion.

The motion was approved with the following roll call vote:

Mr. Marchese	Yes
Ms. Ellis	Yes
Mr. Brodrick	Yes
Mr. Vue	Yes
Ms. Vanderwert	Yes
Mr. Schumacher	Yes
Ms. O'Connell	Yes

**BF 30436** Motion to Adopt the RESOLUTION on Construction of a New Middle School in Area A

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:

- Concern was expressed about the costs of an extra building and increasing the District's foot print. Granted it would be an important investment on the East Side but she was concerned that by increasing the number of buildings would SPPS actually see enrollment growth, can it sustain growth?
- A Board member stated she believed the District has children currently in its schools who will be needing room to go to middle school. Additionally, the East side needs investment. SPPS has a number of buildings it wants to improve but having a new building might lead to elimination of an old building. It might even be created as a K-8.



- A Board member stated he had questioned if it is prudent to spend money on a new building but has been convinced that the investment will be better on the East Side and will be good for SPPS. The enrollment projection is for existing kids that will need space in middle school.
- A Board member stated she thinks SPPS needs to upgrade its image and send a message to kids that they are important.
- A Director indicated he was torn about building on the East Side, he is struggling with the fact that SPPS's reputation is not good right now and is it fiscally responsible when the district is \$15 million in the red.
- The Chair stated that ultimately one needs to look at the process that has been done and it was a very comprehensive process. When you have a process that has been well done you need to support the conclusion offered. There is excitement felt about this project and what this might lead to with councils, the city, etc. We need to have confidence in the process as we move forward.

**MOTION:** Mr. Schumacher moved the Board of Education adopt the Resolution “Construction of a New Middle School in Area A.” Ms. O’Connell seconded the motion.

**RESOLUTION - Construction of a New Middle School in Area A**

**WHEREAS, Saint Paul Public Schools (SPPS) has engaged in an extensive planning process to develop a 10-year Facilities Master Plan (FMP) to ensure school buildings and facilities are able to meet the 21st century learning needs of Saint Paul students; and**

**WHEREAS, as part of the FMP planning process, demographic analyses of housing, birth and enrollment patterns in Saint Paul were conducted;**

**WHEREAS, SPPS projects there will not be enough space for students currently in grades 2, 3, and 4 when they reach middle school; and**

**WHEREAS, SPPS projects an increase in enrollment in SPPS and that SPPS will be short approximately 500 student seats in grades 6, 7, and 8 by 2019-2020 and at least 700 student seats by 2024-2025; and**

**WHEREAS, SPPS has further determined that students on the East Side of Saint Paul in Area A will need a middle school option in the near future; and**

**WHEREAS, Area A does not have a comprehensive middle school option aligned with its elementary academic pathway; and**

**WHEREAS, the new middle school is estimated to cost approximately \$65-\$70 million to build and have a \$1.5M annual operating budget; and**

**WHEREAS, the Board of Education has the authority to locate and acquire necessary sites for schoolhouses and to erect schoolhouses on sites acquired, pursuant to Minnesota Statutes section 123B.51, subdivision 1;**

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Education of Independent School District No. 625 as follows: Construction of a new middle school building in Area A is necessary and serves a public purpose; Acquisition of a site is necessary for the construction of a new middle school in Area A; and Administration is authorized and directed to take all appropriate steps to locate and investigate potential sites for the construction of a new middle school in Area A and is directed to report back to the Board with administration’s findings and recommendations on potential sites and acquisition costs.**

The motion was approved with the following roll call vote:

Mr. Marchese	No
Ms. Ellis	No
Mr. Brodrick	No
Mr. Vue	Yes
Ms. Vanderwert	Yes
Mr. Schumacher	Yes
Ms. O’Connell	Yes

**BF 30437** Motion to Adopt the RESOLUTION on the 2016 Five-Year Facilities Maintenance and Capital Implementation Plan, Covering Fiscal Years 2017-2012

- We are approving a five year plan? Will it be able to be changed? Response: Years 17 and 18 will be in the design phase soon but projects beyond that may change over time. Remember, it will come back for approval every year.
- I want to be sure there is flexibility as work moves forward on the plan – I am concerned about programs which may need resources, facilities, etc. at a time when they do not appear on the plan. Response: That will be taken into account.
- Will the Board weigh in on paying for particular projects? Response: The Board has "power of purse strings"; long-term the Board passed the prioritization with alignment to programming and is adopting a five year implementation structure – if there are a series of issues that come up, the FMP Committee can address the plan. The Board will have, at the least, annual input as it approves the rolling plan every year.
- If I sign off tonight does that include the addition at St. Anthony Park? The Board has given permission to start the design process on that. It does start construction in 2017. It was prioritized in December so we could do proper design work. There will be further opportunities to look at projects. The issue with St. Anthony Park is it needs classroom space for the 17-18 school year because they have more students coming up than there is current space for. Keep in mind other reasons for the St. Anthony Park expansion K-5 is also a priority. The St. Anthony Park project does not correlate to Galtier or other schools in area E. The project is not done until resources have been committed and contracts signed.
- What might prompt moving projects up? Safety? Response: Absolutely, balancing factors, safety is not taken lightly. If SPPS can capitalize on partnerships or grant opportunities that might also bring about reprioritization of projects. There is also the need to balance year to year cash flow and to balance impacts on taxpayers. There will be shifts and flexibility within the process.

**MOTION:** Ms. O'Connell moved the Board of Education adopt the Resolution "2016 Five-Year Facilities Maintenance and Capital Implementation Plan, Covering Fiscal Years 2017-2021". The motion was seconded by Ms. Vanderwert.

**RESOLUTION: 2016 Five-Year Facilities Maintenance and Capital Implementation Plan, Covering Fiscal Years 2017-2021**

**WHEREAS**, on December 15, 2015, the Board of Education (BOE) established a rolling Five-Year Facilities Maintenance and Capital Implementation Plan (hereinafter "Five-Year Plan") to implement the approved 10-year Facilities Master Plan (FMP) and otherwise meet the strategic facility needs for the District; and

**WHEREAS**, the BOE has resolved to approve a rolling Five-Year Plan annually; and

**WHEREAS**, District administration has developed a 2016 Five-Year Facilities Maintenance and Capital Implementation Plan, covering Fiscal Years 2017-2021, with the involvement of a broad cross-section of District stakeholders and the guidance of the FMP Committee; and

**WHEREAS**, District administration proposes that the BOE approve the 2016 Five-Year Facilities Maintenance and Capital Implementation Plan, covering Fiscal Years 2017-2021, as reflected in Attachment A; and

**WHEREAS**, the Board of Education will have continued input into the planning and budgeting process to implement specific projects in the 2016 Five-Year Facilities Maintenance and Capital Implementation Plan, covering Fiscal Years 2017-2021;

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** that the Board of Education of Independent School District No. 625 herewith: Commits to and approves the 2016 Five-Year Facilities Maintenance and Capital Implementation Plan, covering Fiscal Years 2017-2021, as reflected in the 2016 Five-Year Facilities Maintenance and Capital Implementation Plan, subject to the Board's future funding of specific projects.

The motion was approved with the following roll call vote:

Mr. Marchese	Yes
Ms. Ellis	Yes
Mr. Brodrick	Yes
Mr. Vue	Yes
Ms. Vanderwert	Yes
Mr. Schumacher	Yes
Ms. O'Connell	Yes

**BF 30438**      Resolution Providing for the Competitive Negotiated Sale of \$15,000,000 General Obligation School Building Bonds, Series 2016A

**BF 30439**      Resolution Providing for the Competitive Negotiated Sale of \$37,635,000 General Obligation School Building Refunding Bonds, Series 2016B

The representative from Springstead stated these resolutions authorize Springstead to go out for bids and define terms of the offers. She indicated there would be a net savings of \$3.9 million with the refundings, a 9% savings. The winners will be the taxpayers. Springstead has combined the issues in order to save SPPS money. There will be a rating call with Standard and Poors and Moody's on June 1. Bids will be received June 21 and once verified, resolutions of sale will be completed for the Board's approval. If interest rates or bond markets begin to change the sale can be stopped or the refunding pulled. Springstead wants to maximize savings received on the sale.

**MOTION:** Ms. O'Connell moved the Board of Education approve the Resolution Providing for the Competitive Negotiated Sale of \$15,000,000 General Obligation School Building Bonds, Series 2016A and the Resolution Providing for the Competitive Negotiated Sale of \$37,635,000 General Obligation School Building Refunding Bonds, Series 2016B. Ms. Vanderwert seconded the motion.

The motion was approved with the following roll call vote:

Mr. Marchese	Yes
Ms. Ellis	Yes
Mr. Brodrick	Yes
Mr. Vue	Yes
Ms. Vanderwert	Yes
Mr. Schumacher	Yes
Ms. O'Connell	Yes

## **XII. BOARD OF EDUCATION**

A. Information Requests & Responses - None

B. Items for Future Agendas

1. A couple Board members to work with administration on process to involve the communities in the various Areas to look at options in the total area and use this as a chance to engage, to learn what is working, what is not, about concerns and having enough stakeholders to use this as a planning process to find where to go with options in the areas, flesh out a proposed process and bring it back to the COB in June.

C. Board of Education Reports/Communications - None

## **XIII. FUTURE MEETING SCHEDULE**

A. Board of Education Meetings (5:30 unless otherwise noted)

- May 17
- June 14 - Special - Non-Renewals - 4:00 p.m.
- June 21
- July 12 - 6:30 p.m.

- August 23
- September 20
- October 25
- November 22
- December 13
- January 10 - Annual Meeting - 4:30 p.m.
- January 24
- February 21
- March 21
- April 18
- May 16
- June 13 - Non-Renewals - 4:00 p.m.
- June 20
- July 11
- August 15

B. Committee of the Board Meetings (4:30 unless otherwise noted)

- May 3 – 4:00 p.m.
- June 14 - 4:45 p.m.
- July 12
- September 13
- October 4
- November 8
- December 6
- January 10 - 5:15 p.m.
- February 7
- March 7
- April 11
- May 2
- June 13 - 4:45 p.m.
- July 11

**XIV. ADJOURNMENT**

**MOTION: Mr. Brodrick moved the meeting adjourn, seconded by Ms.Vanderwert.**

The motion was approved with the following roll call vote:

Mr. Marchese	Yes
Ms. Ellis	Yes
Mr. Brodrick	Yes
Mr. Vue	Yes
Ms. Vanderwert	Yes
Mr. Schumacher	Yes
Ms. O'Connell	Yes

The meeting adjourned at 10:43 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  
 Marilyn Polsfuss  
 Assistant Clerk,  
 St. Paul Public Schools Board of Education