INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 625  
Saint Paul, Minnesota  
MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION  
April 19, 2011

I. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 5:52 p.m.

II. ROLL CALL

PRESENT: Mr. Brodrick, Ms. Street-Stewart, Ms. Carroll, Mr. Hardy, Ms. Kong-Thao, Ms. O’Connell, Superintendent Silva, Jeff Lalla, General Counsel and Marilyn Polsfuss, Assistant Clerk.

ABSENT: Mr. Risberg
Ms. Carroll left the meeting at 9:03 p.m.

III. APPROVAL OF THE ORDER OF THE AGENDA

A. Order of the Consent Agenda

MOTION: Ms. Carroll moved the Board of Education approve the order of the Consent Agenda with the exception of Item E1: Action on Probationary Teacher and Item E7: Increase Lunch Prices to Students Paying Full Price; both were pulled for separate consideration. Motion seconded by Ms. Kong-Thao.

The motion was approved with the following roll call vote:

Mr. Brodrick  Yes
Ms. Street-Stewart  Yes
Ms. Carroll  Yes
Mr. Hardy  Yes
Ms. Kong-Thao  Yes
Ms. O’Connell  Yes

B. Order of the Main Agenda

MOTION: Mr. Hardy moved the Board of Education approve the order of the Main Agenda with revisions noted. Motion seconded by Ms. O’Connell.

The motion was approved with the following roll call vote:

Mr. Brodrick  Yes
Ms. Street-Stewart  Yes
Ms. Carroll  Yes
Mr. Hardy  Yes
Ms. Kong-Thao  Yes
Ms. O’Connell  Yes

IV. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

A. Approval of the Minutes of the Regular Meeting of the Board of Education of March 15, 2011

MOTION: Ms. Kong-Thao moved the Board of Education approve the Minutes of the Regular Meeting of the Board of Education of March 15, 2011. Motion seconded by Ms. Carroll.

The motion was approved with the following roll call vote:

Mr. Brodrick  Yes
Ms. Street-Stewart  Yes
Ms. Carroll  Yes
Mr. Hardy  Yes
Ms. Kong-Thao  Yes
Ms. O’Connell  Yes

B. Approval of the Minutes of the Special Closed Board of Education Meeting of March 15, 2011

MOTION: Ms. O’Connell moved the Board of Education approve the Minutes of the Regular Meeting of the Board of Education of March 15, 2011. Motion seconded by Ms. Carroll.

The motion was approved with the following roll call vote:
Mr. Brodrick  Yes
Ms. Street-Stewart  Yes
Ms. Carroll  Yes
Mr. Hardy  Yes
Ms. Kong-Thao  Yes
Ms. O’Connell  Yes

V. COMMITTEE REPORTS

A. Committee of the Board Meeting of April 5, 2011

1. Proposed 2011-12 School Calendars
Staff provided a presentation on the 2011-2012 SPPS School Year Calendar which included the District-wide School Calendar and the year-round school calendar for Crossroads.

Highlights noted regarding the calendar were:
• The first week of school will provide the opportunity for parent/teacher conferences for all grade levels, not just kindergarten. This will help to set the stage for the coming school year with goal setting, meeting the teacher, reviewing spring MAP data,
• Kindergarten and pre-school teachers will also have two full days for conferences and two days of job-embedded professional development during the first week of school.
• All student release days occur during the week of October 17 that also includes the statewide teacher meetings.
• Winter break is eight days with students returning to school Wednesday, January 4. The primary reason for the shorter break is due to where Christmas and New Years fall and the impact a 10-day break would have on the last day of school (moving it into the second full week in June).
• Friday, April 6 is professional development day for all grades.
• The school year will end on Friday, June 8.
• Summer school, including GRAD preparation, begins Monday, June 18.

The recommended motion was held until the presentation on the calendar was made during the Superintendent’s report.

2. ARRA Update
Staff provided a Year 2 Implementation Update on the ARRA Funding. It was noted funding ends as of June 30, 2011 (as the Minnesota Department of Education budget year closes then) and does have staffing implications on the upcoming budget.

There were seven key areas evaluated; the data warehouse was removed, as it is no longer ARRA funded.
• Response to Intervention (RtI)
• Work with Leadership & Learning Center (LLC)
• Strengthening Literacy Instruction (MONDO, RIS)
• Assessment (MAP, End of Course)
• Cultural Proficiency (CP)
• Special Education Redesign (special education collaboration and Universal Design for Learning, reform of EBD programming)
• Positive School-wide Behavior Model (PSB)

The report reflected Step 1, a review of implementation and Step 2 an evaluation of short-term effectiveness. Step 3 will evaluate long-term outcomes and will be done later in the year.

RECOMMENDED MOTION: That the Board of Education accept the Year 2 ARRA Implementation Update with thanks.

The motion was approved with the following roll call vote:
- Mr. Brodrick Yes
- Ms. Street-Stewart Yes
- Ms. Carroll Yes
- Mr. Hardy Yes
- Ms. Kong-Thao Yes
- Ms. O’Connell Yes

3. Leadership Development Overview
The Office of Leadership Development provided an overview of the learning opportunities for all leaders through coaching, mentoring, critical friends groups, Minnesota Principal’s Academy participation and a year long Learning Catalyst Cohort. These learning opportunities will provide:
• Authentic learning in context, learning while doing the work
• Differentiated opportunities based on strengths and needs
• Targeting individuals and teams
• Focusing and aligning within each school or department strategic plan
• Long-term sustainability
• A culture of learning based on trust, collaboration and reflective practice.

Objectives for 2010-12 included:
• Expanding the scope to include all leaders in the district
• Aligning and making development relevant to the specific needs of each site and program
• Rigorously assessing effectiveness to continually refine and improve supports to leaders.

RECOMMENDED MOTION: That the Board of Education accept the Overview of Leadership Development provided to them with thanks.

The motion was approved with the following roll call vote:
- Mr. Brodrick Yes
- Ms. Street-Stewart Yes
- Ms. Carroll Yes
- Mr. Hardy Yes
- Ms. Kong-Thao Yes
- Ms. O’Connell Yes

A board member commented that this was a very significant and important extension of SPPS’s leadership development process.

4. Standing Item: Strong Schools, Strong Community Update/Program Changes
The Chief of Staff outlined what the Superintendent would discuss at the upcoming Board meeting on the 19th.

5. Standing Item: Policy Update
Staff reviewed the proposed changes to the two policy items brought to the COB (Policy 209.00 Development, Adoption, Implementation and Monitoring of Policies and Policy
RECOMMENDED MOTION: That the Board of Education accept the recommended changes to Policy 209.00 Development, Adoption, Implementation and Monitoring of Policies and Policy 209.01 Regulatory System and that the two policies be brought to the April 19, 2011 Board meeting for their first reading.

The motion was approved with the following roll call vote:

- Mr. Brodrick Yes
- Ms. Street-Stewart Yes
- Ms. Carroll Yes
- Mr. Hardy Yes
- Ms. Kong-Thao Yes
- Ms. O’Connell Yes

5. Work Session
- Board Budget Review & Justification
  Board members were provided with a brief overview of the Zero-based Budgeting process and were then provided with the worksheets for review and revision prior to submission to the Zero Based Budgeting Review Committee and the formal establishment of their 2011-12 budget.

Board members scheduled an additional Committee of the Board meeting on April 12 at 4:30 p.m. specifically to address the Board budget.

- BFAC & CEAC Process
  There was discussion on use of the committees for the coming year and the Board expressed interest in interviewing the applicants for the committees during the upcoming process. The subject was moved to the May COB meeting agenda for further discussion.

- Board of Education Meeting Dates for Remainder of Calendar Year 2011
  Board members were provided with suggested dates for Board and COB meetings through January 2012.

RECOMMENDED MOTION: That the Board of Education approve the dates, as presented, for the COB and Board meetings running from August 2011 through January 2012.

The motion was approved with the following roll call vote:

- Mr. Brodrick Yes
- Ms. Street-Stewart Yes
- Ms. Carroll Yes
- Mr. Hardy Yes
- Ms. Kong-Thao Yes
- Ms. O’Connell Yes

- Scheduling of Board Representation at Graduation Events
  Board members were provided with a schedule of the 2011 graduations dates and agreed upon representation at all graduation events.

B. Committee of the Board Meeting of April 12, 2011
Board members continued their discussion of the 2011-12 Board of Education Budget that is being developed utilizing zero-based budgeting methods. Each of the budget categories was reviewed and modified as necessary. Staff was instructed to provide board members with a final summary sheet of the budget prior to its being submitted to the ZBB Review Committee.

MOTION: Ms. Carroll moved the Board of Education accept the report on the Committee of the Board meetings of April 5 and 12, 2011. Motion seconded by Mr. Hardy.

The motion was approved with the following roll call vote:
VI. RECOGNITIONS

**BF 28606** Acknowledgement of Good Work Provided by Outstanding District Employees and Departments

1. **Nancy Orr**, Humboldt High School, received the 2010 Outstanding Biology Teacher of the Year Award from the National Association of Biology Teachers.
2. **Vernon Simmons**, School Resource Officer at Johnson High School, was named Outstanding Juvenile Officer of 2010 for Minnesota.
3. **Dr. Fatima Lawson**, principal of L’Étoile du Nord French Immersion School, was recognized by the Minnesota Elementary School Principals’ Association (MESPA) with the 2011 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.
4. **Emily Holder**, Discovery Club Site Manager at Horace Mann School, was presented the Minnesota School-Age Care Alliance (MnSACA) award for “Significant Impact on the field of Care and Education for School-age Children and Youth.”
5. Eight teachers were awarded grants for summer travel/study from Fund for Teachers, a partnership of the Saint Paul Public Schools, Saint Paul Foundation and the National Fund for Teacher Program that awards grants for self-designed professional growth to PreK-12 teachers.
   - **Kimberly Colbert**, Central Senior High School
   - **Heidi Geimer**, Capitol Hill Gifted and Talented Magnet
   - **Juliana James**, St. Anthony Park Elementary
   - **Wanda Jenkins**, Capitol Hill Gifted and Talented Magnet
   - **Denise Kapler**, Washington Technology Secondary
   - **Naomi Larson**, Johnson Senior High School
   - **Brad Ollman**, St. Anthony Park Elementary
   - **Kristin Peterson**, Battle Creek Elementary
6. **Mai Blia Thao**, social worker and interpreter, received the Distinguished Service Award. The Executive Committee of the Minnesota Speech-Language-Hearing Association awarded Mai for her significant contributions to students with speech and hearing impairments and their families..

**BF 28607** Acknowledgement of Accomplishments of SPPS Students

1. **Zophia Dadlez**, a sixth grade student at L’Étoile du Nord French Immersion School, won the Saint Paul Public Schools 2011 Spelling Bee and **William Yang**, an eighth grade student at Farnsworth Aerospace PreK-8 Magnet, was the second place winner in the Saint Paul Public Schools 2011 Spelling Bee.
2. Three SPPS seniors will receive $4000.00 scholarships from the Children's Defense Fund-Minnesota because of the way they “Beat the Odds” as they grew up and are now preparing to go to college.
   - **Amira Gill** from Central Senior High
   - **Abdirahman Hassan**, Como Park Senior High School
   - **Sasha Sanz**, Como Park Senior High School

**MOTION:** Ms. Kong-Thao moved the Board of Education recognize the employees and students above for their contributions and outstanding work. Motion seconded by Mr. Brodrick.

The motion was approved with the following roll call vote:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Brodrick</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Street-Stewart</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Carroll</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Hardy</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Kong-Thao</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. O’Connell</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ms. Street-Stewart  Yes
Ms. Carroll  Yes
Mr. Hardy  Yes
Ms. Kong-Thao  Yes
Ms. O’Connell  Yes

VII. HEARING ON PERMANENT CLOSURE OF THE FRANKLIN SCHOOLHOUSE BUILDING & PUBLIC COMMENT

- Sarah Geving – Finding ways to let the community know about how great SPPS schools actually are.
- Bob Zick – Make the Board of Education website more accessible, alternative licensing, open enrollment and a meeting with the Superintendent.

VIII. SUPERINTENDENT’S REPORT

A. Administrative Proposal for the Closure of the Franklin Schoolhouse Building

The Chief Business Officer, on behalf of the Superintendent, recommended that the Franklin Schoolhouse be permanently closed and that it be transferred to the City of St. Paul in exchange for the East Side Community Center building attached to Harding High School for the following reasons:

- The City of St. Paul has proposed to trade its East Side Community Center building to the District in return for the Franklin Schoolhouse.
- The estimated market value of Franklin is $2,978,910 and its annual operating costs are $370,709. It consists of 55,165 square feet and has a remaining economic life of 10 years.
- The estimated market value of the East Side Community Center building is $2,724,090 and its annual operating costs are $147,625. The Community Center consists of 21,968 square feet and has a remaining economic life of 22 years.
- If the City’s proposal is accepted by the District, the $254,820 difference in market value between the Franklin Schoolhouse and the East Side Community Center building will be recouped by the District in 1.14 years due to the $223,084 difference in operating costs. Subsequently the District will be saving $223,084 in annual operating costs if it transfers the Franklin Schoolhouse in return for the East Side Community Center.
- Ownership of the East Side Community Center building will provide Harding Senior High School with much needed additional space for multiple purposes, both day and evening, such as parental outreach, professional staff development, testing, office space for community service support programs, technology support staff and community education, as well as continuation of the day care program currently located in the Center.
- The City of St. Paul’s Valley Recreation Center, adjoining and attached to the Franklin Schoolhouse, is leased by the City to the Mount Airy Boys and Girls Club which desires to expand its programming and consequently needs to expand the facility. Transfer of the Franklin Schoolhouse to the City of St. Paul will allow the City to, in turn, lease it to the Mount Airy Boys and Girls Club to remodel the Franklin Schoolhouse in order to expand its programming to area residents, which programming supports the School District goals for the youth of St. Paul.

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION

- This real estate transaction represents the beginning of an effort on the part of both the school district and the City to work together and collaborate, where it makes sense, to reduce costs for taxpayers.
- What is the planned use for the East Side Community Center? Financially and operationally, this move makes sense for SPPS and on the City’s part; they consider it a win win situation. Harding is a popular high school so the community center will provide additional space for the school in providing classes for students. Both Harding staff and East Side Community Center has provided Harding a great deal of support, resources and space for day and evening use. It provides space for day care, IB testing, staff development. The added space will be a great resource and will benefit the entire east side of St. Paul.
• The heavy day and evening use will continue, what kind of programming will be involved? Some ideas include supporting professional development internally (PLCs), parenting and adult education, students aged out of high school and needing continuing education and it will provide a number of uses for the East Side of St. Paul.
• Will Merrick move out entirely? That has not been addressed at this point, but they will probably stay at least for the interim period. ECFE early family education is there, neighborhood partners use the space.
• This is seamless, both community and school district space already in use for multiple purposes and a newer facility for SPPS.
• What are the plans for the Franklin building? The building provides expansion space for the boys and girls program. It will be used to align with the City’s SPROCKETS effort. It probably will also house community agencies to serve students and families.

The Superintendent indicated she would complete the remainder of her report following the Recognitions and the Public Hearing on the Permanent Closure of the Franklin Schoolhouse set for time certain at 7:00 p.m.

B. Administrative Proposal for 2011 Calendar
The Superintendent stated the District had conducted a survey of staff relative to the question of their supporting all early release days in the first week of school. The response was 46% supported the idea and 54% did not. The typical response was “establishing ritual and routine for a classroom are essential for a strong start to the year. With a week of half days, “establishing those routines would be delayed, along with getting down to the business of learning.”

Based on staff and parent feedback administration is now proposing that the Early Release Days continue on a quarterly basis on the calendar. The suggested Early Release Days are now: September 30, November 10, February 3 and April 27.

Winter Break is eight days with students returning to school on Wednesday, January 4. This option provides two additional instructional days before MCA II testing and allows summer school to start on June 18, giving students three full weeks to prepare for the GRAD test. Starting school on January 4 also allows families and staff who may travel more flexibility in getting return flights during heavy holiday traffic. The District Parent Advisory Council was very much in favor of the eight day break rather than having students out until January 9. Staff also supported the eight day break with 66% in favor and 34% opposed.

Spring Break is March 12-16. The MCA II will likely be held the week of April 9. Holding spring break early in March provides for three uninterrupted weeks of instruction prior to testing. The consistency of instruction leading up to the testing window is crucial to student achievement gains. A later (end of March) break was considered but the instruction preceding the spring MCA II testing was considered critical to student success on the tests. 62% of staff supported the earlier spring break with 38% opposed.

April 6, 2012 is Good Friday. In the past there has been difficulty finding enough substitute teachers and bus drivers on that day and there has been high absenteeism in students as well. April 6 is scheduled as a Professional Development Day on the calendar.

Next year the District will again consider the four early release days at the start of the year in order to provide time for teachers to develop partnership with families to support student development.

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:
• The elementary conferences, do the schools accommodate both day and evening conferences for parents? Response: The reason evening conferences are not listed is because each school decides on evening conference dates that best meets their schedule and each notifies the families of those dates. The flexibility provides families the opportunity to meet the conference schedules involved with multiple students.
• The change in early release dates, the conjunction of two Fridays (1/27 and 2/3) is that a concern?  Response: In the past all early release dates have been either Mondays or Fridays, this makes it easier for families to know when days are during year.  Fridays seem to be the optimal day and this year that has been made consistent for the sake of families and staff. Even with early release, the students still have three-quarters of a day as instructional time so the day counts as an instructional day.

• April 6, Good Friday, are there any concerns about staff participation in professional development?  Good Friday has been used as a professional development day for several years and the District has found that relatively few staff take that as a holiday and there has not been unusual absenteeism.  Additionally schools can structure the professional development to accommodate staff.

• March 9, will the two evenings of conferences be the week of March 5 rather than that Friday?  Response:  Friday is a full day of conferences and most schools schedule evening conferences ahead of that time. Generally, conferences wrap up with the full day on Friday.

MOTION: Ms. Carroll moved approval of the 2011-2012 SPPS School Calendar as presented with thanks for all of the work done on it and the effort made to get responses from the survey.  Ms. O'Connell seconded the motion.

The motion was approved with the following roll call vote:

Mr. Brodrick      Yes
Ms. Street-Stewart Yes
Ms. Carroll       Yes
Mr. Hardy         Yes
Ms. Kong-Thao     Yes
Ms. O'Connell     Yes

C. SSSC Implementation Update

1. Strategic Plan Implementation Process & Roles

The Chief of Staff presented the conceptual framework for the implementation process and a discussion on the roles of the three main entities involved in the process.

The Board approved the overall strategic plan framework in March 2011. The next phase of implementation will launch in May. To achieve effective implementation there are three main pieces to the work.

• The Board of Education involvement will be ongoing throughout the process by monitoring progress toward implementation. Individual board members will be asked to sit on action teams as contributing members. The Board as a whole will vote on recommendations brought forward by the Superintendent that require policy change or act on governance actions coming forward from Action Teams.

• The Superintendent’s Cabinet, which is senior leadership of the district, will serve as the internal implementation team responsible for ensuring the processes and practices necessary to move the work forward within the defined timelines. They will make sure recommendations coming from the Action Teams are economically feasible, meet policies of the Board, monitor progress and provide advice to the Superintendent.

• The bulk of the work will be done by Action Teams that will be lead by district facilitators with representation from SPPS staff, family and community members. Each team will review information specific to its area and will review evidence-based practices, local assets and options for service. Action Teams will develop recommendations for implementation, which will be submitted through the Cabinet to the Superintendent for approval. Their work will occur between May and December 2011 although some team may work beyond that period if their area involves changes in subsequent years. End dates will be specific to each Action Team.

Currently, Action Teams are considered for the following areas:

○ Achievement Gap
○ Transition to Middle Grades
The Superintendent is at the center of all of these three groups and information flows back and forth around the accountability areas in a dynamic manner.

There will be smaller teams (Site Specific Teams) which will be utilized to address issues specific to a school or program. This will include the principal, district staff, parents and community members. The Site Specific Teams will follow the same procedures as the Action Teams with recommendations going to the Cabinet and then to the Superintendent for decision.

At this point, the Implementation Timeline is projected to be:

- May-December 2011 will include the initial phases to redesign existing practices in the Action Team areas to support the changes in subsequent years.
- May, 2011 – Launch of Action Teams
- January-June 2012 will find a new school choice process in place for all school selection (Fall 2012)
- 2012-2013 school year will see new high school boundaries and programming in effect
- 2013-2014 will see new elementary and middle school boundaries and programming in effect along with a full transition from junior high schools to middle schools.

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:

- The Action Teams, when will the process for populating these teams be communicated? Response: Administration is in the process of getting that work done now; it should be available the first week in May.
- Will the site-specific teams work on the same timeline? Response: Some site teams have begun work already and administration is trying to identify these, as administration needs to define the parameters under which they should work and the process they will use to bring their recommendations forward. It is also necessary to be certain there is adequate district-level support to work with them.
- Start times for high schools, where would that fit with a team or is it a stand-alone item? Response: That topic could fit under budget and finance as transportation drives costs. It may also fit and overlap with academic programming (specialized) as there is good research showing a later start time is beneficial to high school students. There are some topics that will overlap and administration needs to make sure there is a structure there for those overlaps of areas.
- How is the determination about which sites will be included in site-specific teams and with the specialized programming action team being made? Is it however is most vocal or are there other criteria? Response: No, it is not based on who is most vocal. It is based on action teams reflecting a broad district-wide scope where the work cuts across the entire district (i.e., the move to middle schools would include what that programming looks like, how it is integrated into the school environment, teacher licensing, etc.). Site specific will not have district-wide implications. It is about the scope and implications of the work as to whether it is an Action Team or a Site Specific Team. These teams do not take the place of the normal course of work within individual schools. The teams are to make sure staff time is maximized and so there is a chance to listen to the expertise of people currently at sites and experts on subject areas.
- Where would something like language academy fall? Response: The language academy has been associated with the ELL department. The rationale was to make sure each area had the opportunity to have one or more language academies. They
do not fall into this discussion because we already have them in place, there will be no change. The only thing that is happening is that the District is moving language academies out of certain schools because they are not being supported or because there are too many within a specific area. That is more related to programming rather than an Action Team.

- Some of this is based on the Model Neighborhood Action Model. Under that model there is discussion across action groups so they all are kept informed through agreed upon ways in which information is shared out to the sub-groups. Will there be such a process for SPPS?  
Response: The reality is the District is developing an action plan specifying how it wants to proceed and it will want to take the recommendations to the teams to create ownership on the plans. There will be reporting available. The District will try to keep information as transparent as possible. The plan will be shaped according to each team and its task.

2. **Update on Vision Cards**

SPPS, as part of its strategic plan, will be implementing a district-wide reporting system based on the Teamwork’s’ Continuous Improvement Model with its inputs, process and outcomes. This will provide a monitoring tool for administration and a model for reporting to the Board. In order to improve, the District must focus on (a) Outcomes [achievement and equity] and (b) Processes [where work is done to change the outcomes].

The current SPPS reporting system is based on an annual report with separate reports on student progress (MCA results, on-track for graduation, MAP, Mondo, discipline, etc.). The new process will be multi-layered and based on planning, monitoring and reporting at the strategic, operational and tactical levels. The levels are “strategic” which are district-wide, overall strategic plans “operational” (departments, schools and program plans) and “tactical” (individual teams, individual employee level practices and tasks which contributed to overall results).

Monitoring will be through eight District Vision Cards which will be reported to the Board on the basis of one topic per month. The topics include:

- **Goal 1 Achievement:** October - Achievement; November - Equity and December - Student Data plus Work.
- **Goal 2 Alignment:** January - Shared Leadership; February - Professional Development and March - Partnerships
- **Goal 3 Sustainability:** April - Resources and May – Operational Excellence.

The Operational area includes department plans which will be reported through progress reports to the cabinet on a quarterly basis. And, School/Program Plans which will be reported through Goal 1 vision cards through quarterly review to/with Assistant Superintendents and with staff.

The Tactical Level planning will be through job description and/or individual performance plans, as appropriate. Review will be through formative reviews (as appropriate) with the position supervisor.

The alignment of outcomes potentially is:

- **Achievement** – to school dashboard and to principal/administrator evaluation (growth and change only).
- **Equity** to the school dashboard and to principal evaluation (change only)

There are five Vision Card Levels 1 = intervene, 2 = concern, 3 = baseline, 4 = progress and 5 = vision. Board reporting will be at the “vision” level.

Measures for the vision card topics (at Level 5) are:

- **Achievement** – Growth and Proficiency
  - MAP Growth - % of students made growth >70%
  - MCA Growth - % of students medium or high growth >90%
  - Mondo Assessment Proficiency K-2 (Milestone 1) >75%
MCA 3rd Grade (Milestone 2) >75%
MCA 5th Grade (Milestone 3) >75%
MCA 7th Grade (Milestone 4) >75%
MCA 8th Grade Ready for High School (Milestone 5) >75%
MCA-M 2% Alt. Assessment (Baseline Spring 2011) N/A
MTAS Participation (% of identified MTAS eligible) >95%

Achievement – Capstone check has changed
AP Score 3/IB Score 4 or Higher (Milestone 7) >75%
GRAD Math – pass on first time (Milestone 6) >75%
GRAD Reading – pass on first time (Milestone 6) >75%
GRAD Writing – pass on first time (Milestone 6) >90%
ACT Participation >75%
ACT Composite Score of 21 or higher (Milestone 7) >75%
Graduation Rate 9-12 Cohort (Milestone 7) >98%

Equity
Largest % gap between student groups – MCA Math < 10%
Largest % gap between student groups – MCA Reading < 10%
Largest % gap between student groups – MCA Science < 10%
Discipline Referrals – Disproportionality (highest risk ratio) < 2.0
Suspension/Dismissal – Disproportionality (highest risk ratio) < 2.0
Special Ed. Referrals – Disproportionality (highest risk ratio) < 2.0
Absences – Disproportionality (highest risk ratio) < 2.0
Gifted/Talented Identification – largest % gap < 10%
AP/IB Class Participation largest % gap < 10%

Student Data & Work
Use of data to inform instruction % of teachers >90%
Use of common assessments % of PLCs >90%
Delivery of district curriculum % of teachers >90%
Provide daily feedback to students using rubric % of classrooms >90%
Student engagement % of classrooms >90%

Leadership
% of administrators with current evaluation complete >95%
% of administrators satisfactory or better on each of 6 core competencies >90%
% of departmental plans updates in last quarter based on data review >90%
% of schools who revisited their school plan in last quarter based on data review >90%

Professional Development
Instructional staff participation on PLCs % meeting at least weekly >90%
Training in use of differentiated instruction % of teachers >90%
Instructional collaboration training % of staff >90%
Participation in PD aligned with Managed Instruction % of required staff >90%
Support and coaching toward full implementation % of trained staff utilizing additional PD tools >90%
All staff participation in cultural proficiency PD >90%
Principal engagement in ongoing leadership development >90%
Training in “PLCs with Data Teams” process at targeted schools % of teams >90%

Partnerships
Parents/guardians knowledgeable about how to support their students’ education >90%
Perception of safety of school % of parents agree >90%
Welcome at school % of parents agree >90%
Overall quality of key district partnerships >75%
Students in grades 10-12 served by a college readiness program >90%

GOAL 3
Resources
Maintain 3% net favorable variance from budget <3%
Maintain fund balance of 5% >5%
Time & effort certifications on Federal Grants (managers up-to-date) 100%
% market share (enrolled in SPPS as % of all in city) >78%
% students staying enrolled across transition grades >88%

- **Operational Effectiveness**
  - Proficient staff retention rate >90%
  - Bus route arrival at school within 5 minutes of schedule >99%
  - Average students per bus (all runs) >90
  - Number of runs per bus >5.5
  - Employee issues resolved within 90 days >90%
  - Information Technology first contract resolution >70%
  - Breakfast participation >60%
  - Lunch participation >80%

**QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:**
- The Board complimented administration for coming up with the metrics for measurement which establishes a good base to start from.
- The Goal 1 percentages – Capstone, the GRAD Reading at 75% is this for year one? The reading is for the first time students take the test in 10th grade and the goal is to have 75% of them passing the first time they take the test. Why is the goal that low? Response: The 75% is the goal for 10th grade and the goals have to achievable. In that 10th grade group there will be students coming from other countries with limited language skills, from different schools/states again with various skill levels and there are those students who do not take the test seriously.
- There has been flat growth in the 9th grade so this appears to be too low a number; this is not pushing hard enough for the African American students. Response: If your question is, why is the percentage of students passing on first test 75% and not higher, the district numbers are currently much lower than 75%. This goal is at level 5, it represents a starting point, it is an identified target that is a stretch and which aligns with the overall goal of 75% proficiency for the student population while not being so far from the Level 5 goal as not to be reachable within a reasonable amount of time. The Board can push to change the Level 5 Vision if it desires. The current percentage for 2010 is 53% at 11th grade.
- On the graduation rate at 98% -- is that 4 years? Yes, that is the four-year cohort completion rate, which tends to be lower.
- Graduation, so these are the kids who do not vanish. How does the district account for the kids who vanish? Response: The district uses two calculations on graduation rate. The NCLB rate includes students enrolled at any point in time in the district and does account for student in and out of the system. The cohort completion rate shows students enrolled all of their time within the district.
- It was requested that as these numbers are reported out to the Board that it be done at a COB (prior to going to the BOE meeting) so there can be deeper discussion and understanding of them.
- Are the percentages all of the student population as a whole or is it breaking areas down? How is the percentage achieved? Response: It is the entire student population but each measure can and will be disaggregated for each student group. The goal is that for every student enrolled in the district that 75% or more achieve the goal. Then the numbers will be disaggregated to look at each group individually.
- So the goal is 75% for the whole, how will it look for specific groups? Response: This is where the equity vision card comes in as it allows for the identification of the gaps within each measure for student groups.
- The transiency of students – is there a way to get a handle on student achievements if they keep moving from district to district? Response: Where ever the student graduates from gets credit for the graduation. Some of the challenges around the transient population and the ways graduation rates are calculated are due to a variation in how various states/entities calculate it. There is a national effort to standardize the metrics on how graduation rates are calculated.
- How does a student count as a dropout or as a transfer to another district? Response: There is great activity behind the scenes to ensure the paperwork is handled properly throughout the transfer process. There are ways to account for all variations and there are procedures to identify transfers and/or dropouts.
Regarding college readiness, why are only 90% being supported? Isn’t that too low? Response: This is above 90% and could be set higher. However, given the transiency of students and the fact some may choose not to participate in a program, this is a more realistic number. The metric is by choice of student not by what the district offers. Some students choose to work rather than go to college. The district tries to match all students who desire college but some choose not to participate.

The leadership metrics, a concern was raised whether the expected reporting is going to increase the required level of reporting to state and federal entities. Don’t we want the instructional leaders included as well? Response: Instructional Leadership is one of the core competencies included in the HR performance evaluation tool under development at this time.

In terms of increasing the load of paperwork? Response: This is part of the performance evaluation system and is an expectation that has been set of administration. The vision card rolls up those results and becomes a tool that draws meaning out of the evaluations.

In general in the area of college readiness partnerships, what would be of interest would be is the number appropriate for a population. It is hoped that staff looks to tailor and target efforts where the need is the greatest rather than assuming everyone needs everything.

D. Leadership Development Planning

It was stated the MCA-II Reading Proficiency Trends from 2005-2010 for all tested grades are static so this indicates development needs to move in a different direction. This led to a new paradigm for leadership development which is:

- Moving to an authentic learning within the context of learning while doing the work
- Differentiating opportunities based on strengths and needs
- Targeting individuals and teams
- Focusing and aligning to each school or department strategic plan
- Sustaining the effort over the long-term over multiple layers
- Creating a new basis for learning which is built on trust, collaboration and reflective practices.

The work aligns directly with the three goals of the SSSC Strategic Plan.

To support goal 1, achievement, the new leadership development will build:

- Strong instructional leaders
- Shared leadership
- Skilled, active teacher leaders
- Targeted, differentiated learning opportunities.
- Differentiating and accommodating career path and where needs are

To support goal 2, alignment the new leadership development will provide for:

- Learning networks of leaders
- Clearly identified objectives and expectations
- Differentiation of supports across career stages

For Goal 3 it will provide:

- Leaders accountable to each other within the district community
- Partnerships
- Continuous feedback loops
- Cost-effectiveness.

Examples of new leadership development opportunities include a Learning Catalyst Cohort (support for principal and leadership team for selected schools. Co-facilitated by resident experts in field), a Critical Friends Network (lead learners within small groups) and job-embedded coaching (strength based coaching doing own self assessments of where strengths and needs are to increase effectiveness in particular areas).
QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:

- The funding source, what happens when it runs out?  Response: One piece is developing leadership within the buildings through this leadership development, who in turn provided support and development within itself to be leaders and work together. Professional development provides opportunities for everyone to continue to use the strength and strategies gained through the training. Money from Travelers is available for three additional years and the federal grant for an additional four years. The District will create capacity within its buildings to provide on-going development. The development will build from a base of 10-14 schools in the first year and then expand in the following year as possible.

- What needs to be addressed is the long-term influence of the new paradigm. How in four years, as employees come into district, is there a plan on how to intentionally and purposefully introduce those new employees to this model at the same time as they are introduced to the district? What would that look like? Additionally, as families arrive, how will they be introduced to some of these concepts around leadership? How can the District say leadership development opportunities will be different here? Response: Leadership has to change in a way that there is a certain level of expectation about what principals should be doing, what teachers should be doing and what the clientele needs. The clientele are parents, students, business partners. This is building the next generation of St. Paul residents. This is talking about training leaders to believe the first contact establishes relationships with the community. The District needs to build the strength and abilities for principals and leadership teams so they can deliver the best message and performance for students and then how to let others know. The District needs to think differently about the role of public education. What are the needs and how to deliver the product in a different way? Need to think about how to move to the next level of education that meets the needs of 21st century learners and leaders. Need to create an environment of strong schools and communities with leadership happening at building level not at the individual level. The District can no longer reinvent every time personnel changes, it needs to build a continuum within the community to continue the path.

- For the Goal 1 list, where is the encouragement for building leaders to raise the expectations of achievement for students in that building?  Response: Strong instructional leaders establish the basis for improvement within buildings. The leader’s use of data to evaluate where the needs are within buildings and using that data to push for increased achievement in those areas. It is also about establishing a culture within buildings with shared leadership with the strong expectation that all kids WILL achieve. The alignment goes to the vision cards and back to the principal evaluation being the driver for achievement results within schools. This is laid out clearly within the vision cards. This is the type of culture shift which develops the strong motivation and the kind of learning necessary to get the bar up and see the achievement scores move up for all of the kids.

- This work is also going to affect the charter schools and their leadership based on the chart from AMSD, which showed potential funding with larger portions of the resources being directed to smaller schools, private schools and charters along with the expansion of the voucher programs. Charter schools have different leadership outcomes and a more autonomy. What will be the influence of SPPS on charters in this area since SPPS is one of the three districts being compared to charter schools more and more? What are the intended outcomes with leadership opportunities and will SPPS be able to say this is as good as or better than what charters provide? How will SPPS do that? Response: The culture of public education in America today is under attack particularly through the area of funding. SPPS is working with some charters under the Federal grant with the idea of gaining knowledge for both entities. There needs to be a culture of sharing and improving education. Of trying to create opportunities to develop innovative frames of cooperation through sharing of innovation. Charters operate under different laws and policies but when there is a comparison, there is not much difference between systems. SPPS needs to work with charters to find different ways to approach issues and each can be a benefit to the other.
The key is the opportunity for innovation – the grant is a pairing of two charters with three SPPS schools. The opportunity will be there to learn from each other and try new things within the partnership over the next five years.

- The cultural shift and cultural competency, how does that tie into training and leadership development. Where does cultural competency come in? What is the metric that shows staff within the district has achieved that competency? Response: The key is in the collaborative work done with the Office of Academics in which leaders and the different layers of leadership in the district can demonstrate that competency. The Equity Vision Card is a tool that will tell the district if it is disproportionately suspending a certain demographic group, or seeing gaps in certain groups within the system. The right kinds of measures are in place to show that kind of competency within the leadership and the various levels of leadership in St. Paul. Cultural competency is a learning that will not be done within one or two years but the District can track and measure the narrowing of gaps through the vision cards. The Courageous Conversation work has had the district leadership deeply immersed in racial equity work and in changing of language of the district so all decisions within the district are measured against the cultural competency scale.

- A request was made to see a cultural competency accountability measure incorporated into the Performance Evaluation of the leaders within buildings. Response: The District is now measuring outcomes and showing the impact of how people behave on the students.

E. Human Resource Transactions

MOTION: Ms. Carroll moved the Board of Education approved the Human Resource Transactions for the period February 25 through March 28, 2011 as revised. Motion seconded by Ms. Kong-Thao.

The motion was approved with the following roll call vote:
Mr. Brodrick Absent
Ms. Street-Stewart Yes
Ms. Carroll Yes
Mr. Hardy Yes
Ms. Kong-Thao Yes
Ms. O’Connell Yes

IX. CONSENT AGENDA

MOTION: Ms. Kong-Thao moved the Board of Education approve all Consent Agenda Items with the exception of Item E1 Action on Probationary Teacher and E7 Increase Lunch Prices to Students Paying Full Price which were pulled for separate consideration. Motion seconded by Ms. Carroll.

The motion was approved with the following roll call vote:
Mr. Brodrick Yes
Ms. Street-Stewart Yes
Ms. Carroll Absent
Mr. Hardy Yes
Ms. Kong-Thao Yes
Ms. O’Connell Yes

A. Gifts

BF 28608 Gift Acceptance from the Kopp Family Foundation (Central)
That the Board of Education authorize the Superintendent (designee) to all Central High School to accept a monetary gift from the Kopp Family Foundation to be used as designated. The total gift of $6,000.00 will be deposited into the Central High School intra-school account, 19-210-000-000-5096-0000.
BF 28609  Acceptance of Scholarship from the Kopp Family Foundation in Partnership with KOPP Investment Advisors

That the Board of Education authorize the Superintendent (designee) to allow Johnson Senior High School to accept this grant from the KOPP Family Foundation in partnership with Kopp Investment Advisors. This grant of $5,000 will be deposited into the Intra-School Fund, #19-230-000-000-5096-0000.

B. Grants

BF 28610  Request for Permission to Submit a Grant Application to 3M in Support of District Science Programs (SSEI)

That the Board of Education authorize the Superintendent (designee) to submit a grant application to 3M to support, maintain and expand the District’s Strategic Science and Engineering Initiative; to accept funds, if awarded, and to implement the project as specified in the award documents.

BF 28611  Request for Permission to Submit a Grant Application to the 3M Foundation (SSSC)

That the Board of Education authorize the Superintendent (designee) to submit a grant application to The 3M Foundation; to accept funds, if awarded; and to implement the project as specified in the award documents.

BF 28612  Request for Permission to Submit a Grant Application to the Bigelow Foundation

That the Board of Education authorize the Superintendent (designee) to submit a grant application to The Bigelow Foundation; to accept funds, if awarded; and to implement the project as specified in the award documents.

BF 28613  Request for Permission to Submit a Grant Application to the Braitmayer Foundation

That the Board of Education authorize the Superintendent (designee) to submit a grant application to the Braitmayer Foundation to purchase technology that allows differentiated instruction; to accept funds, if awarded; and to implement the project as specified in the award documents.

BF 28614  Request for Permission to Submit a Grant Application to the H.B. Fuller Foundation

That the Board of Education authorize the Superintendent (designee) to submit a grant application to the H. B. Fuller Foundation to expand science instruction; to accept funds, if awarded; and to implement the project as specified in the award documents.

BF 28615  Request for Permission to Submit a Grant Application to the Minnesota Department of Education (Literacy)

That the Board of Education authorize the Superintendent (designee) to submit a grant application to the Minnesota Department of Education to develop cohesive literacy curriculum across the district; to accept funds, if awarded; and to implement the project as specified in the award documents.

BF 28616  Request for Permission to Submit a Continuation and Renewal Grant Application to the Minnesota Department of Education for the 2010-11 School Improvement Grant (SIG)

That the Board of Education authorize the Superintendent (designee) to submit the continuation and renewal grant application to the Minnesota Department of Education for funds to continue the School Improvement Grant (SIG) at Maxfield and Humboldt; to accept funds, if awarded; and to implement the project as specified in the award documents.

BF 28617  Request for Permission to Submit a Grant Application to the PPG Industries Foundation
That the Board of Education authorize the Superintendent (designee) to submit a grant application to the PPG Industries Foundation for African drumming lessons; to accept funds, if awarded; and to implement the project as specified in the award documents.

**BF 28618 Request for Permission to Submit a Grant Application to the Saint Paul Foundation (SSSC)**

That the Board of Education authorize the Superintendent (designee) to submit a grant application to The Saint Paul Foundation; to accept funds, if awarded; and to implement the project as specified in the award documents.

**BF 28619 Request for Permission to Submit a Grant Application to the U.S. Department of Homeland Security**

That the Board of Education authorize the Superintendent (designee) to submit a grant application to the U.S. Department of Homeland Security to create and implement education and services to newcomers of St. Paul; to accept funds, if awarded; and to implement the project as specified in the award documents.

**BF 28620 Request for Permission to Submit a Grant Application to the U.S. Department of Transportation**

That the Board of Education authorize the Superintendent (designee) to submit a grant application to the U.S. Department of Transportation to develop STEM curriculum; to accept funds, if awarded; and to implement the project as specified in the award documents.

**BF 28621 Request for Permission to Submit a Grant Application to the Weesner Foundation**

That the Board of Education authorize the Superintendent (designee) to submit a grant application to the Weesner Foundation for transportation costs to and from the Center; to accept funds, if awarded; and to implement the project as specified in the award documents.

C. **Contracts** - None

D. **Agreements**

**BF 28622 Authorization for Amendment No. 4 to Lease Agreement for Space at 1919 University Avenue (AGAPE/TTI)**

That the Board of Education authorize the Chair and Clerk to execute Amendment No. 4 to the lease agreement for space in Suites 300 and 400 at 1919 University Avenue, Saint Paul, MN, for a six (6) month term, commencing July 1, 2011 and terminating December 31, 2011 in accordance with all terms and conditions of said agreement.

**BF 28623 Approval for Memoranda of Agreement Between Independent School District No. 625, Saint Paul Public Schools and Saint Paul Federation of Teachers and the Saint Paul Principals Association**

That the Board of Education authorize the Superintendent (designee) to approve the Memoranda of Agreement between the Saint Paul Federation of Teachers, the Saint Paul Principals Association and Saint Paul Public Schools regarding the Early Retirement Incentive (ERI) Severance Pay for teachers, principals and educational assistants.

E. **Administrative Items**

**BF 28624 Amendment to Independent School District No. 625 403(b) Tax-Deferred Retirement Plan for Sheltering Severance Pay and Vacation Pay**

That effective April 20, 2011, the Plan be amended as set forth above. That the Board of Education adopt the above amendment to the Independent School District No. 625 403(b) Tax-Deferred Retirement Plan for Sheltering Severance Pay and Vacation Pay and that the Board of Education authorize and direct the Superintendent or the Superintendent’s designee to execute additional agreements and documents necessary to carry out the proposes of the Plan, including any amendments thereto and to take actions necessary or advisable to effectuate the Plan’s purposes and the ensure the Plan’s compliance with law.
BF 28625  Establishment of the Unclassified Position of Facilities Department Assistant 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 Facilities Department Assistant job title effective April 19, 2011 that the Board of Education declare the position of Facilities Department Assistant unclassified; and that the pay rate be Grade 9 of the 2010-2011 Professional Employees Association standard ranges.

BF 28626  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 28, 2011 should they not comply with Minnesota State Health Standards for Immunizations on or before this date.

BF 28627  Request for Permission to Enter into Food Service Agreements with Various Schools and Programs

That the Saint Paul Public Schools’ Board of Education authorize the Superintendent or designee, to enter into agreements to provide food service for non-Saint Paul district schools and programs.

BF 28628  Request for Permission to Submit an Application to the State for Kindergarten Milk Program Funds

That the Saint Paul Public Schools’ Board of Education authorize the Superintendent or designee, to submit an application for Kindergarten Milk Funds for the 2011-2012 school year and, if granted, to accept such funds.

BF 28629  Monthly Operating Authority

That the Board of Education approve and ratify the following checks and wire transfers for the period.

(a) General Account  #485372-487037  $53,310,674.12
    #3015405-3015501
(b) Debt Service -0- 503,772.61
(c) Construction -0- 601,335.71
    $54,415,782.44

Included in the above disbursements are payrolls in the amount of $35,246,345.23 and overtime of $133,873.34.

(d) Collateral Changes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Custodian</th>
<th>Cusip</th>
<th>Security</th>
<th>Maturity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wells Fargo</td>
<td>83164JYZ3</td>
<td>Small Business Admin Poll #507928</td>
<td>11/25/2031</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 19, 2011.

BF 28630  Request for Permission to Submit an Application to the State for School Breakfast, School Lunch and After School Snack

That the Saint Paul Public Schools’ Board of Education authorize the Superintendent or designee, to submit a consolidated application for School Breakfast, School Lunch and Afterschool Snack Funds for the 2011-2012 school year and, if granted, to accept such funds.

BF 28631  Request for Permission to Submit an Application to the State for Summer Food Service Program Funds

That the Saint Paul Public Schools’ Board of Education authorize the Superintendent or designee, to submit an application for Summer Food Service Program and, if granted, to accept such funds.
BF 28632 Approval for Inter-District Summer Programming in 2011
That the Board of Education authorize the Superintendent (designee) to implement Inter-district Summer Programs in 2011.

F. Bids
BF 28633 Bid A9423-M: Pupil Transportation Summer 2011
That the Board of Education accept the bid rates as submitted.

BF 28634 Bid No. A9426-K Window Replacement at Highwood Hills Elementary School
That the Board of Education authorize award of Bid No. A9426-K for construction of window replacement at Highwood Hills Elementary School to Val Pro Glass, LLC for the lump sum base bid plus alternates no. 1 and 2 of $104,140.00.

BF 28635 Bid No. A9427-K Piping Replacement at Battle Creek Middle School
That the Board of Education authorize award of Bid No. A9427-K for construction of piping replacement at Battle Creek Middle School to PMI Construction for the lump sum base bid plus alternates no. 1 and 2 of $858,600.00.

BF 28636 A9429-K Roof Replacement at Ramsey Junior High School
That the Board of Education authorize award of Bid No. A9429-K for construction of roof replacement at Ramsey Junior High School to John A. Dalsin & Sons for the lump sum base bid plus alternate no. 2 of $355,803.00.

BF 28637 Bid No. A9430-K Secure Entry and Playground Improvements at Nokomis Elementary School
That the Board of Education authorize award of Bid No. A9430-K for construction of secure entry and playground improvements at Nokomis Elementary School to Prestige Builders, Inc. for the lump sum base bid of $102,000.00.

BF 28638 Bid No. A9432-K Construction of Office Expansion and Miscellaneous Improvements at Mississippi Elementary School
That the Board of Education authorize award of Bid No. A9432-K for construction of office expansion and miscellaneous improvements at Mississippi Elementary School to Schreiber Mullaney Construction for the lump sum base bid of $352,890.00.

BF 28639 Bid No. A9434-K Boiler Replacement at Open World Learning Community
That the Board of Education authorize award of Bid No. A9434-K for boiler replacement at Open World Learning Community to Albers Mechanical for the lump sum base bid of $163,500.00.

CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS PULLED FOR SEPARATE CONSIDERATION

BF 28640 Action on Probationary Teacher
Director Hardy indicated he would be voting no on this item as he had some concerns about the work environment.

MOTION: Director Kong-Thao moved the Board of Education finds, concludes and directs: That P.Y. did engage in the conduct set forth in the Superintendent's Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendation to the Board of Education for Discharge of P.Y.; That such conduct by P.Y. constitutes inefficiency in teaching as set forth in the Superintendent's Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendation to the Board of Education for Discharge of P.Y.; That the Superintendent's Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendation for Discharge of P.Y. are adopted by the Board of Education; That P.Y. be discharged from his employment as a teacher; That the Clerk of the Board of Education provide P.Y. with a written statement of the cause of such discharge; That P.Y.'s discharge shall take effect thirty (30) days after the Clerk of the Board of Education provides P.Y. with a written statement of the cause of such discharge; and That P.Y.
remain on administrative leave with pay until the effective date of his discharge. Ms. O’Connell seconded the motion.

The motion was approved with the following roll call vote:

- Mr. Brodrick: Yes
- Ms. Street-Stewart: Yes
- Ms. Carroll: Absent
- Mr. Hardy: No
- Ms. Kong-Thao: Yes
- Ms. O’Connell: Yes

**BF 28641 Increase Lunch Prices to Students Paying Full Price**

Director O’Connell moved the action, seconded by Ms. Kong-Thao. She then asked that more information be provided on the impact of this action. Specifically why the increase and what is the effect of the Healthy Hunger-Free Kids Act of 2010.

The Director of the Department of Nutrition and Commercial Services stated the Healthy Hunger-Free Kids Act requires schools to “charge students for paid meals at a price that is, on average, equal to the difference between the Federal Free Meal Reimbursement and the paid meal reimbursement.” Schools that currently charge less are required to gradually increase their prices over time until they meet the requirement. The maximum annual increase in the required paid increases is $.10 annually.

The current price for paid meals at the elementary level is $1.75, for secondary $2.00. This is approximately the same cost as the Minneapolis schools. SPPS has one of the lowest lunch prices in the area with only Minneapolis and South St. Paul being comparable. The current Federal Free Lunch Reimbursement is $2.74; the paid lunch reimbursement is $.28 leaving a difference to be reached by SPPS of $2.46. The State of Minnesota contributes $.12 toward the reimbursement of school lunches (free, reduced and paid). This could be used to contribute toward the differences.

**QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:**

- This change does not affect prices for students on free or reduced price lunches, correct. Response: No it does not affect these.
- What is the period for the increase? How long will this that place? Response: Two to three years for secondary lunches, five to six years for elementary. This is of course dependent upon whether additional reimbursement is received or removed. The State contributes $.12 per lunch, which could be applied to reduce this. This will not affect Breakfast to Go.
- What percent of SPPS students pay full price? 72% of SPPS families are eligible for free or reduced meals, so 28% pay for lunch or at least those who choose to participate.
- Is there a need for any additional advocacy relative to other requirements of the law? Response: The Healthy Hunger-Free Kids Act of 2010 has a deadline of April 15 for comment. The CGCS provided comments that the action to change dietary requirements occurs too fast and that it is too costly. St. Paul if fortunate that it has a central production facility with a talented staff so that cooking from scratch can be done. SPPS has already implemented most of the required changes. This should be possible to implement under the current budget.
- Concern was expressed about the parameters of the type of food allowed within a school building. What about family nights, potlucks, etc. How is this affected? Response: USDA has control over foods sold in schools; this will not prohibit pot lucks or things of that nature. The ala carte sales within the school nutrition programs does have new requirements and that applies to whatever is sold within a school building (vending machines, etc). The SPPS Wellness Policy covers much of this so SPPS is ahead of the curve.

**MOTION:** Ms. O’Connell moved, seconded by Ms. Kong-Thao, the Board of Education authorize the Superintendent or designee to increase lunch prices by $.10 effective September 1, 2011.

- Elementary lunch to $1.85
Secondary lunch to $2.10
Adult lunches to $3.60, Adult Choice Bar only $2.60
Joint Agreement schools contracted with Nutrition and Custodial Services, to $2.40 elementary, $2.50 secondary.

The motion was approved with the following roll call vote:
Mr. Brodrick Yes
Ms. Street-Stewart Yes
Ms. Carroll Absent
Mr. Hardy Yes
Ms. Kong-Thao Yes
Ms. O’Connell Yes

X. OLD BUSINESS
XI. NEW BUSINESS

BF 28642 Resolution Providing for the Competitive Negotiated Sale of $26,000,000 General Obligation School Building Bonds, Series 2011A

MOTION: Mr. Hardy moved the Board of Education approve the Resolution Providing for the Competitive Negotiated Sale of $26,000,000 General Obligation School Building Bonds, Series 2011A Ms. Kong-Thao seconded the motion.

The motion was approved with the following roll call vote:
Mr. Brodrick Yes
Ms. Street-Stewart Yes
Ms. Carroll Absent
Mr. Hardy Yes
Ms. Kong-Thao Yes
Ms. O’Connell Yes

BF 28643 Resolution Providing for the Competitive Negotiated Sale of Refunding Full Faith and Credit Certificates of Participation, Series 2011B

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:
• SPPS is doing this to save money for the taxpayers, so what amount is saved?
  Response from Springsted representative: The COP refunding saving for the next four years is over $250,000. This does not go back into the general fund but it does lower the tax burden for taxpayers. There were two additional refundings which were pulled because of current markets. This debt is being monitored to find opportunities to refinance it at a future date which when it occurs will provide additional tax relief for the taxpayers.

MOTION: Mr. Hardy moved the Board of Education approve the Resolution Providing for the Competitive Negotiated Sale of Refunding Full Faith and Credit Certificates of Participation, Series 2011B. Ms. O’Connell seconded the motion.

The motion was approved with the following roll call vote:
Mr. Brodrick Yes
Ms. Street-Stewart Yes
Ms. Carroll Absent
Mr. Hardy Yes
Ms. Kong-Thao Yes
Ms. O’Connell Yes

BF 28644 Resolution for the Permanent Closure of the Franklin Schoolhouse Building
Resolution for the Conveyance of the Franklin Schoolhouse Building to the City of Saint Paul

MOTION: Ms. Kong-Thao moved the Board of Education approve the Findings and Resolution for the Permanent Closure of the Franklin Schoolhouse Building and that it approve the Resolution for the Conveyance of the Franklin Schoolhouse Building to the City of Saint Paul. Motion seconded by Ms. O’Connell.

The motion was approved with the following roll call vote:

Mr. Brodrick Yes
Ms. Street-Stewart Yes
Ms. Carroll Absent
Mr. Hardy Yes
Ms. Kong-Thao Yes
Ms. O’Connell Yes

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:

- Clarification was made that the second portion of the Conveyance of the Franklin Schoolhouse Building to the City of Saint Paul also included the reversion of the East Side Community Center building to the School District.

E. First Reading: Policy 209.00 Development, Adoption, Implementation and Monitoring of Policies

F. First Reading: Policy 209.01 Regulatory System

The Board Chair announced the two policies were being brought forward for their first reading and are available for review on the Board website with a link from its home page.

The Chief of Accountability, Planning and Policy stated the main purpose of the revisions was to resolve conflict between the two policies regarding the board’s roles in development of Administrative procedures which in turn clears the way for development of new/revised administrative procedures.

It was noted that public comment on the policies is welcome.

XII. BOARD OF EDUCATION

A. Information Requests & Responses - None
B. Items for Future Agendas - None
C. Board of Education Reports/Communications

Director Kong-Thao reminded everyone of the 15th Annual Hmong Conference which is occurring over the coming weekend. The conference will address the subjects of leadership, education and health care.

XIII. FUTURE MEETING SCHEDULE

A. Board of Education Meetings (5:45 unless otherwise noted)

- April 19
- May 17
- June 7 – Special 4:00 p.m.
- June 21
- July 19
- August 16 (Tentative)
- September 20
- October 18
- November 15
- December 13
- January 10, 2012 -- SPPS Annual Meeting (4:30 p.m.)
- January 17
B. Committee of the Board Meetings (4:30 unless otherwise noted)
   • April 5
   • May 3
   • June 28
   • July 19
   • August 23
   • September 13
   • October 4
   • November 1
   • December 6
   • January 10, 2012 -- 5:00 p.m.
   • January 31

XIV. ADJOURNMENT

MOTION: Director Brodrick moved the meeting adjourn. Director Kong-Thao seconded the motion.

The meeting adjourned at 9:30 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