I. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 5:54 p.m.

II. ROLL CALL

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

III. APPROVAL OF THE ORDER OF THE AGENDA

A. Order of the Consent Agenda

MOTION: Ms. Carroll moved, seconded by Ms. Kong-Thao, the Board of Education approve the Order of the Consent Agenda with the exception of Item C2: Request for Approval of Initial Contracts with State-Approved Providers of Supplemental Education Services (SES) as Required by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB) which was pulled for separate consideration.

The motion was approved by the following roll call vote:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brodrick</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street-Stewart</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carroll</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risberg</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardy</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kong-Thao</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O’Connell</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Order of the Main Agenda

MOTION: Mr. Hardy moved, seconded by Ms. Kong-Thao, the Board of Education approve the Order of the Main Agenda as published.

The motion was approved by the following roll call vote:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brodrick</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street-Stewart</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carroll</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risberg</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardy</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kong-Thao</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O’Connell</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IV. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

A. Minutes of the Regular Meeting of the Board of Education of September 20, 2011

MOTION: Mr. Brodrick moved, seconded by Ms. Carroll, the Board of Education approve the Minutes of the Regular Meeting of the Board of Education of September 20, 2011 as published.

The motion was approved by the following roll call vote:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brodrick</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
V. SPECIAL RECOGNITION

A. “Outstanding Legislators for 2011” by the Minnesota School Boards Association (MSBA)

The Minnesota School Boards Association expressed its appreciation to Representative Carlos Mariani and Senator John Harrington for their dedicated and thoughtful consideration of school issues and their support for MSBA’s legislative interests, policies and priorities during the 2011 legislative sessions. Both gentlemen were named MSBA Outstanding Legislators for 2011.

VI. COMMITTEE REPORTS

A. Committee of the Board Meeting of October 4, 2011

The first agenda item was a review of the Final 2010-2011 Budget Revisions. The revisions were in the fully financed funds (grant adjustments) for Community Service and the General Fund. With those revisions, the total revenue for FY 11 was $656,752,734 and the total expenditures were $656,106,142.

RECOMMENDED MOTION: That the Board of Education approve the final 2010-11 budget revisions as presented.

The motion was approved by the following roll call vote:

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

The next item was a review of the proposed Budget Guidelines for FY 2013. The guidelines included:
1. The philosophy it was supporting (SSSC Plan)
2. How the budget calculations would be prepared in the areas of revenue projection, inflation, enrollment, average salary and benefits calculation data and fund balances.
3. Creating the budget for schools and non-school programs
4. Compilation and presentation of the FY 13 budget

RECOMMENDED MOTION: That the Board of Education approve the FY 2013 Budget Guidelines as presented.

The motion was approved by the following roll call vote:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brodrick</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street-Stewart</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carroll</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risberg</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardy</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kong-Thao</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O’Connell</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
An Update on District Action Teams was provided along with a timeline for reporting out to the Board.

Dr. Robicheau, Superintendent for EMID, provided an update to the Board on the issues facing the East Metro Integration District.

The American Indian Parent Committee presented their Resolution of Concurrence. The Resolution covered several areas:
1. American Indian Studies with requests presented in the areas of the school name, staffing positions within the American Indian Studies program, the American Indian Magnet School principal vacancy and concerns regarding keeping the American Indian Studies Program intact with city-wide busing for its students.
2. Follow Up On Previous Administrative Agreements was discussed in depth.

RECOMMENDED MOTION: That the Board of Education accept the Indian Education Act Resolution of Concurrence 2010-2011 as submitted by the Parent Committee of the SPPS Indian Education Program pending the Administrative Response.

The motion was approved by the following roll call vote:
- Brodrick Yes
- Street-Stewart Yes
- Carroll Yes
- Risberg Yes
- Hardy Yes
- Kong-Thao Yes
- O’Connell Yes

The Capital Expenditure Advisory Committee (CEAC) then presented their recommendations for Capital Bonding Projects along with a review of the process and criteria used in making their recommendations.

The allocations recommended by the committee totaled $15,000,000 and were allocated across the following areas:
- Site requested single proposals & ranked improvement projects
- Infrastructure upgrades to support the Technology Integration Plan
- Strategic plan implementation projects
- Security infrastructure upgrades
- Energy efficiency improvements
- Miscellaneous projects
- Project management salaries and a
- Contingency of 10%

RECOMMENDED MOTION: That the Board of Education approve the Recommendations from the Capital Expenditure Advisory Committee on Capital Bonding Projects as presented.

The motion was approved by the following roll call vote:
- Brodrick Yes
- Street-Stewart Yes
- Carroll Yes
- Risberg Yes
- Hardy Yes
- Kong-Thao Yes
- O’Connell Yes

Appreciation was expressed for the work of CEAC, for the process used and thanks were extended to the members of the CEAC Committee for their participation in the work.

A brief report from the Policy Work Group was made regarding the advertising policy.
The Board then moved into a Work Session which resulted in two actions:

1. **CEAC Appointments**

**RECOMMENDED MOTION:** That the Board of Education minutes reflect the final list of appointments to the Capital Expenditure Advisory Committee.

The motion was approved by the following roll call vote:

- Brodrick: Yes
- Street-Stewart: Yes
- Carroll: Yes
- Risberg: Yes
- Hardy: Yes
- Kong-Thao: Yes
- O'Connell: Yes

The appointments to the 2011-12 Capital Expenditure Advisory Committee are:
- Jennifer Ampulski
- Jemal Bedaso
- John Decker
- Edward Driscoll
- Amy Filice
- Phillip Peterson
- Michael Roehr
- Richard Streeper
- Zachary Wilson

2. **Board Listening Sessions**

**RECOMMENDED MOTION:** That the Board Chair initiate a meeting with the District Parent Advisory Committee and use that meeting to get input on how to make the listening sessions better attended, along with suggestions for dates and locations.

The motion was approved by the following roll call vote:

- Brodrick: Yes
- Street-Stewart: Yes
- Carroll: Yes
- Risberg: Yes
- Hardy: Yes
- Kong-Thao: Yes
- O'Connell: Yes

**MOTION:** Director Hardy moved the Board accept the report out of the October 4 Committee of the Board meeting. The motion was seconded by Ms. Carroll.

The motion was approved by the following roll call vote:

- Brodrick: Yes
- Street-Stewart: Yes
- Carroll: Yes
- Risberg: Yes
- Hardy: Yes
- Kong-Thao: Yes
- O'Connell: Yes

**VII. RECOGNITIONS**

**BF 28787**  
Acknowledgement of Good Work Provided by Outstanding District Employees and Departments
1. **Renee Combs**, Health Teacher at Farnsworth Aerospace 5-8, for being named American Association of Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance (AAPERD) Health Teacher of the Year for Minnesota.

2. **Dr. Fatima Lawson**, principal at L’Etoile du Nord French Immersion, on being awarded the American Council for International Education (ACIE) Exchange Scholar Award to Brazil 2011-12. As a result of the award, the school was visited by Brazilian school administrators Jacqueline de Oliveira Guimaraes, Marlene Terezinha Malischtzky Zimmer and Viviane Miranda Rocha who were introduced at the Board meeting.

**MOTION:** Ms. Kong-Thao moved the Board of Education recognize and congratulate the individuals above for their outstanding work. Motion seconded by Ms. Carroll

The motion was approved by the following roll call vote:

- Brodrick: Yes
- Street-Stewart: Yes
- Carroll: Yes
- Risberg: Yes
- Hardy: Yes
- Kong-Thao: Yes
- O’Connell: Yes

**VIII. PUBLIC COMMENT**

- Eric Wahberg - F1 Area Boundaries and affect on community
- Molly Noble - F1 Area Boundaries works counter of SSSC Plan
- Deb Rosenthal - F1 Area Boundaries and how affects families/neighborhood
- Lisa Arnet - F1 Area Boundaries family identifies with Highland community
- Jim Rosenthal - F1 Area Boundaries and communication of plan and transition timing
- Brent Bauer - F1 Area Boundaries and impact on families
- Rose Wahlberg - F1 Area Boundaries and loss of school community
- Bob Zick – need for Board to take active role in managing school system, outsourcing of district functions (security and fire alarm)

**IX. SUPERINTENDENT’S REPORT**

**A. One Thing I Love Campaign**

The Superintendent reported on highlights of the “One Thing I Love About St. Paul Public Schools Enrollment Campaign.” Two videos were presented covering the kick-off of the campaign. She noted the focus of the campaign was to encourage families to send their children to SPPS by showcasing the opportunities available through SPPS to students and families.

The Director of Communications, Marketing and Development reported out on various aspects of the campaign including the “One Thing I Love” bus and expressed thanks to everyone who participated in the launch. She noted “One Thing I Love” is a more targeted approach to communicate with families about opportunities offered by St. Paul Public Schools; it is personal, local and grass roots, a non-traditional way to get the word out to the community. It will raise awareness of the good things happening in the schools and provide tools for sharing those things with the rest of the district and community. She expressed the District’s appreciation for the support of the St. Paul Foundation, the Bigelow Foundation and 3M for funding the campaign.

**QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:**

- It was noted the bus participated in the first Como High School homecoming parade.
- Thanks were expressed that the District is finally marketing itself by highlighting its strengths. The question was asked whether alumni were being contacted for their “One
Thing” about their success since graduating. Staff said they would add this to their list of things to add to the campaign.

B. SSSC Monitoring – Achievement Vision Card

The Superintendent stated this was the first report on the vision card monitoring and reporting system for the SSSC Strategic Plan. She went on to say there would be a report on VisionCards included in each monthly COB meeting with a further report at the Board meeting. The VisionCards were implemented as a way to monitor the ongoing efforts in moving the plan forward. The cards will provide a way to recognize what is working and what needs to be scaled up to replicate best practices or revised to better address issues that emerge.

She went on to say most of the information provided in this report has been reported out separately in the past. This is the first time the information has been combined as a whole set of data on the ways students are being monitored. The information will be made available for community review.

The Chief of Accountability stated the objectives were to review the VisionCard background, to walk through the 2011 Achievement Results and Analysis in the areas of proficiency and growth (MCA, MAP, Mondo Bookshop Assessments, etc.) and Capstone areas (GRAD, ACT, Graduation) and to review actions being taken on the results of Goal 1 review.

To review the background context she reviewed the strategic level of monitoring and reporting on results within the first VisionCard – Achievement. The cards are based on a continuous improvement model involving inputs, processes and outcomes with the focus on primary outcomes in achievement and equity. The processes (the remaining vision cards) function to help influence outcomes.

VisionCards represent a summary of district-wide indicators of progress on the SSSC Strategic Plan and are grouped by themes. They are aligned to goals (achievement, alignment and sustainability), are clear and concise (and if possible presented in a visual format). The results are scaled to five levels (intervene, concern, baseline, progress and vision [Level 5]).

Achievement focuses on district-wide achievement results. She then reviewed the Level 5 Vision levels for the nine areas under growth and proficiency and the seven items under the capstone area.

The Chief of Accountability then moved on to make note of the changes that had been made in the reporting since the Board had made its initial approval of the process. In this report:

- The 2011 growth data has not yet been released for MCA results from the State, the data shown for growth and proficiency is for 2010 unless otherwise noted.
- Under the MTAS assessment the measure has been changed from participation to proficiency
- The Vision level was revised for Mondo from 75% proficiency to 90% to correspond with work being done around interventions and supports
- For the Graduation Rate the use of a four-year cohort completion rate was added as a second measure in the graduation area and the Vision Level was revised accordingly to 80%. The NCLB graduation rate is also used, but this offers a higher rate than is perhaps actually being achieved, the Vision Level for this is 98%.
- In the area of AP/IB the 2011 data is not yet available. The District receives centralized data for AP; however for IB the District needs to collect the data from each individual school and do an analysis of it which is in process but not completed.

She then reviewed the various keys and levels used in reporting out on the Proficiency and Growth VisionCard noting MCA Growth was available for the first time in 2010; no growth is available for 3rd grade or for Science; individual growth is measured in three categories (low, medium and high) and that the grids utilize 2010 data as 2011 is not yet available.
Proficiency and Growth were reported out in the following areas:

- Race/Ethnicity with the following conclusions: Caucasian students are higher in percent proficient (at or above Vision) and are more likely to be making medium or high growth and that the District needs to make more growth with more students of color to close the gaps.
- Grade Level – proficiency and growth increase to peaks in Grade 6 (the only grade at Progress level) and then decreases in the higher grades.
- 2010-11 MCA Proficiency Results with Trend for Grade Levels. Math trends were not reported because the MCA-III was a new test for Grades 3-8.
- 2010-11 MCA Proficiency Results with Trend for Race/Ethnic Groups which showed all race/ethnic groups increased in percent proficient on 2011 MCA Reading.
- Science showed 28% proficient at 5th grade, 22% proficient at 8th grade (Intervene Level) and 31% proficient for High School (Concern Level). Science MCA results are at the Intervene level for grades 5 and 8, at the Concern Level for high school. No growth data has been calculated for Science.
- Modified and Alternative Assessments
  - MCA-Modified (MCA-M) is a new assessment for students whose disability precludes them from achieving grade-level proficiency. As a new test, no proficiency has been set.
  - MTAS is the State alternative assessment for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities. MTAS is at Progress in Reading and Concern in Math.
- Mondo Bookshop Assessment – Early Readers Report. This is the first time SPPS has set targets for Mondo Bookshop Assessment; this will continue to be monitored and adjusted as needed.
- MAP Growth – students are making either typical growth or not, unlike MCA. Typical growth is defined by NWEA, the creators of MAP. MAP Growth is at Baseline Level.

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:

- Why does growth peak at Grade 6? Response: That is being looked at to try to find why that pattern exists.
- What does implementation of Mondo look like? Response: Mondo materials are used in Grades K-5 for reading. The Readers and Writers Workshop model is incorporated into this. The materials are now aligned across the schools and it is required that they be used. A menu of activities (a pacing guide) is provided so implementation and alignment of instruction is similar across all schools.
- How are Mondo results interpreted for immersion and bi-lingual? Response: For immersion students there is a portion done in grades 2-5 which is the English section. For Spanish there are no Mondo materials but there is another text to teach language proficiency. It is the same thing in the bi-lingual program there are English Mondo materials and another text in the second language which is used. The language which is being taught is assessed.
- It was noted that about 50% of K level students are ELL students who are learning the language and this will affect results.
- Typical growth, is it comparable on a curve or absolute and within what context? Response: Typical growth is growth within a year and is based on a national norm (defined by NWEA) and is different from the norms set within the District.
- What is the summer school impact on student performance? MAP results are initial but show summer school is interrupting but not reversing the cycle of loss in term of reading. Four of the six grades within the analysis show stronger results for summer school than national results, particularly grade 7-8. It also showed stronger results for students attending SPPS summer school than other SPPS students. The only grade with an overall decline was Grade 6, which needs to be looked at. Math results were not as clear as those in reading but did show improvement.
- It was recommended that when the VisionCard material is sent out initially for Board members that it be in color so it is easier to interpret.
- Over the course of a year it is important that the Board track its own growth on how data is used and how it is being used to know where the District is going.
- It is going to be important that specific information on how the District will improve the numbers in science are available over the next year.
As the District looks at what is working and what has contributed to the success and what the best practices are, there need to be specific ways to track success for various groups, levels, and areas. There also need to be strategies for families to help support their children’s achievement. What are the contributing factors that are helping to move achievement?

If unexpected changes occur, it is important these be flagged as an anomaly for Board members. The Board needs to understand if it is a trend, pattern, divergence, or anomaly. If it is determined there needs to be a greater inspection of a particular area, the Board as a whole will need to be ready to take an action asking that more information be provided on a particular element/area. The Board needs to be prepared to provide direction if necessary.

When do building staff (principals, teachers) get this information? The VisionCards is a compilation of all data elements. The data was shared with schools earlier in the process prior to presentation to the Board. School data is available to the schools as soon as it becomes available. MCA and MAP get to the schools as soon as available.

Presentation of this subject tonight is an anomaly in being presented at a BOE meeting rather than a COB meeting. All remaining vision cards will be presented at a COB meeting.

The VisionCards communicate and guide where the District goes. They prioritize the information and assist in showing where the focus needs to be.

When do the action steps reach schools? Response: All staff needs to have this information. The VisionCards need to be in the hands of the whole staff as everyone contributes toward success. When the information is sent to schools, they must write a SCIP plan to target issues or results provided by data. The SCIP provides a vision and defines the actions needing to be taken to improve test results within groups/schools. The plans are available at all schools and are shared with staff in order to address issues. Principal evaluations use the data to set goals and evaluations are related directly to the data.

The District has great performance with some groups of student and very poor performance in other groups. As a system SPPS educates all children but when you look at the data some subgroups are not achieving as needed. As a system SPPS is working to provide the data to the community, families, and agencies. The reality is SPPS cannot do it alone; it needs the support of the community. As a system SPPS is looking for other alternatives, resources, and other ways to address the issues in order to increase the achievement of all students. Administration recognizes the need to do things differently in order to incrementally improve achievement within all groups.

It was asked how growth is calculated on proficiency (low, medium, or high) — growth within one year? Also if they are not proficient was progress low, medium, or high. Response: The data is calculated looking at the percent of students who made medium or high growth regardless of proficiency level.

The District is aiming for at least medium growth. If they are not at proficiency they must make high growth to change. The VisionCards are not the only set of data being looked at within the district. At an operational level schools are looking at data walls, PLCs and school profiles to see how their data plays out at school level. Schools are being taught to look at school level and who needs to make what levels of growth to change achievement.

How do you get down to the school level and have it show up in a classroom to address single students? How do teachers use data to know what students need individually to make growth/proficiency? It was suggested it might be valuable to provide case studies/stories of how things are changing through the use of data. How teachers use data to change instruction to meet the needs of students and address areas of weakness while continuing to improve those who are proficient. The “stories” would personalize how this is working.

The presentation then moved on the review the Capstone Data (college and career readiness indicators). Capstone are those measures that show ultimate outcomes of student trajectory within the system and those college level indicators that show if students are prepared for the next step of college access. This included reports in the following areas:
• GRAD pass on First Attempt – Math is at the Intervene Level. Writing has a higher threshold for Vision level (90%) because results are already near 75%. Reading is at Baseline Level.

• ACT participation and composite scores – participation has increased to Progress Level. Composite scores have held steady even with increased participation and are at Intervene Level.

• Four-Year Cohort Completion Rate – this is following a cohort of students who started 9th grade in an SPPS school and four years later the cohort is divided into three groups: Graduated in four years; Continued in SPPS and Dropped out and did not re-enroll in SPPS by the following fall. Students who transferred into or out of the district are not included in this calculation. The Vision Level for this is 80%. The four-year completion rate is a more complete picture of student outcomes. This is at Progress Level.

• The NCLB Cumulative Graduation Rate (Vision Level 98%) is defined and used by the State for NCLB purposes. It counts the total number of students graduating divided by the total number of graduates and dropouts (students who were not found as re-enrolled in any other school in the State by the following fall) multiplied by 100. Students who transferred into the district are included in this calculation. The NCLB graduation rate has increased steadily and is now at Progress Level. This calculation will be changing after this year.

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:

• What is available over time on actual graduation rates, how is it tracked and are kids coming into the District tracked? Response: None of the calculations are exactly right and administration is discussing how to better represent its student population. This is an on-going discussion. Students who enter the district are included in the NCLB graduation rate. These students are tracked internally but are not captured in the four-year cohort calculation.

• Do other districts have tools which might be used to gauge mobility and capture students who graduate? Response: The states are getting better and there are opportunities to explore other options.

• It was noted the NCLB cumulative grad rate grew from 82 to 90 in three years.

• What about students taking only the SAT? Response: The majority of SPPS students take the ACT. It would be interesting to watch participation rate and where students are scoring. This means the District is measuring against the standards set by SPPS and challenging to measure against national and international standards.

• Concern was expressed about the lack of AP and IB data from last year. It was suggested a process metric might be looked at to change behavior sooner. Response: SPPS does get data on AP performance from the College Board. IB information is not centralized and goes to individual schools. Structures are in place so the District can report in a more timely fashion in the future.

• It was noted there is an increase in students taking AP classes and the number of students of color taking those classes.

• REQUEST – Can board members see the factors of poverty and low socio-economic data and how that plays out in the various areas.

• For Board Members – When the Board sees a factor at Intervene level how will the Board address those areas, how will it handle intervention? Response: The Board will need to determine how it will respond. A process needs to be determined as this process progresses. The Board has a monitoring responsibility which is more than receiving information, it needs to set direction but a process to do that needs to be determined.

The Chief of Academics then provided information in the area of Action on Goal 1 Results. She reviewed the 2010 status and the expectations of 2014. In those areas actions included:

• Guaranteed Delivery of Curriculum (Aligned Learning)
  o Staying the course on adopted curriculum
  o Ensuring vertical alignment throughout the organization
  o Prioritizing standards/skills expectations to maximize student learning
  o Deepening implementation of instructional practices (Using data to determine areas of focus through Professional Learning Community/Data Teams and doubling Peer Assistance and Review (PAR) coaches to mentor new teachers)
• Better Achievement Throughout the Organization (Racial equity focus, access and engagement)
  o Engage in racial equity work at all levels
  o Increasing classroom management and student engagement to decrease removal from instruction for behavior
  o Expanding out-of-school time opportunities
• Principal as Instructional Leader
  o Emphasizing instructional leadership with feedback to teachers
  o Monitoring principal and assistant principal leadership through new evaluation system
  o Administration modeling instructional leadership
  o Maximizing principals’ time in classrooms by reducing operational duties and minimizing time away from school
• Shared Leadership and Accountability (build support for school system instead of a system of schools)
  o Engaging multiple perspectives through District wide Action Teams and aligned Parent Advisory Committee (DPAC and PACs) structure
  o Convening PLC/DTs of Principals and Assistant Principals
  o Collaborating across departmental teams
• Data Used Throughout the Year to Inform and Improve Instruction (Implementing new monitoring and reporting system for SSSC)
  o Analyzing quarterly data (e.g. MAP, DataZone, GRAD, Credits) and taking action

Thanks were extended to Administration for the very complete presentation on the first VisionCard.

C. Human Resource Transactions

MOTION: Ms. Carroll moved the Board of Education approve the Human Resource Transactions, as published, for the period August 31 through September 28, 2011. Motion seconded by Ms. O’Connell.

The motion was approved by the following roll call vote:

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

X. CONSENT AGENDA

MOTION: Ms. O’Connell moved, seconded by Ms. Carroll, the Board of Education approve all individual Consent Agenda items with the exception of Item C2: Request for Approval of Initial Contracts with State-Approved Providers of Supplemental Education Services (SES) as Required by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB) which was pulled for separate consideration.

The motion was approved by the following roll call vote:

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

A. Gifts
BF 28788 Request to Accept $24,000 Gift From Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community
That the Board of Education authorize the Superintendent (designee) to accept this donation of $24,000 from the Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux (Dakota) Community and to disburse the funds according to the contract.

B. Grants

BF 28789 Request to Accept Visions for Learning Grants from Ecolab to Individual Teachers
That the Board of Education authorize the Superintendent (designee) to accept Ecolab funds as awarded, for the materials and projects as described by the individual teacher applicants and to implement the project as specified in the award documents.

BF 28790 Request for Approval to Apply to the Minnesota State High School League’s Foundation
That the Board of Education authorize the Superintendent (designee) to submit an application to the Minnesota State High School League’s Foundation for monies being awarded to high schools in the State of Minnesota; to accept funds, if awarded; and to implement the project as specified in the award documents.

BF 28791 Request for Permission to Submit a Grant Application to the Office of Higher Education for the Intervention for College Attendance Program (ICAP)
That the Board of Education authorize the Superintendent (designee) to submit an application to the Office of Higher Education to increase the number of students to increase college motivation, readiness and academic preparedness for American Indian students; to accept funds, if awarded; and to implement the project as specified in the award documents.

BF 28792 Request for Permission to Accept a Grant from the Ramsey County Children’s Mental Health Collaborative
That the Board of Education authorize the Superintendent (designee) to accept a grant from the Ramsey County Children’s Mental Health Collaborative for funds to implement a Parent Empowerment Program at Journeys School, to accept funds and to implement the project as specified in the award documents.

BF 28793 Acknowledgement of Receipt of School Facility Improvement Grant
That the Board of Education recognize and acknowledge receipt by Jennie Arnett, Furniture and Move Coordinator in the Facilities Department, of a School Facility Improvement Grant to attend the School Equipment Show, November 30 – December 2, 2011 in San Antonio, Texas.

BF 28794 Request for Permission to Submit a Grant Application to 3M for the STEP Program.
That the Board of Education authorize the Superintendent (designee) to submit an application to 3M to increase the number of students pursuing science or technical fields after graduation; to accept funds, if awarded; and to implement the project as specified in the award documents.

BF 28795 Request for Permission to Submit a Grant Application to the U.S. Department of Education for the Investing in Innovation (I3) Program
That the Board of Education authorize the Superintendent (designee) to submit an application to the US Department of Education to help children ages 3-9 in high-poverty neighborhoods develop skills in reading, math, and communication; to accept funds, if awarded; and to implement the project as specified in the award documents.

BF 28796 Request for Permission to Submit a Grant Application to the U.S. Department of Education for a Promise Neighborhoods Grant
That the Board of Education authorize the Superintendent (designee) to submit an application to the U.S. Department of Education, to offer a robust continuum of seamless cradle-to-career solutions to SPPS students in the Promise Neighborhoods area. SPPS will partner with the Amherst H. Wilder Foundation, the City of Saint Paul, Ramsey County, the Saint Paul Public Schools Foundation, the YWCA, and the Summit University and Frogtown Neighborhood District Councils for the project; to accept funds, if awarded; and to implement the project as specified in the award documents.

C. Contracts

**BF 28797** Request to Approve the 2011-12 Project Early Kindergarten Contract with Resources for Child Caring
That the Board of Education authorize the Superintendent or her designee to approve the Project Early Kindergarten contract with Resources for Child Caring to provide the above mentioned services for the period of July 1, 2011 - June 30, 2012 at the cost of $270,175.00.

D. Agreements – None

E. Administrative Items

**BF 28798** Annual Report on Curriculum, Instruction and Student Achievement
That the Board of Education approve the deadline extension for the 2011 Annual Report on Curriculum, Instruction and Student Achievement through January 31, 2012 and submit notice to the Minnesota Department of Education of the Board’s action.

**BF 28799** 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 October, 27, 2011, should they not comply with Minnesota State Health Standards for Immunizations on or before that date.

**BF 28800** Monthly Operating Authority
That the Board of Education approve and ratify the following checks and wire transfers for the period August 1 –September 30, 2011.

(a) General Account #492617-494548 $142,584,844.05
#3015923-3016020
(b) Debt Service -0- 7,074,565.85
(c) Construction -0- 10,392,612.09
$160,052,021.99

Included in the above disbursements are payrolls in the amount of $45,139,410.32 and overtime of $124,522.89. This report covers 2 months and 4 payrolls. Overtime is .275% of payroll.

(d) Collateral Changes 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 January 17, 2012.

F. Bids

**BF 28801** Bid No. A9479-K Retiree 65+ Health Insurance
That the Board of Education approve the contract for retiree health insurance coverage with HealthPartners effective January 1, 2012, at the proposed premium renewal rates.

**BF 28802** Bid # A150706 -- Refrigerated Buffet Style Serving Bars
That the Board of Education authorize award of bid No. A150706 for furnishing and delivery of Atlas Brand Refrigerated Buffet Style Serving Bars to various school locations to the lowest responsible bidder, Strategic Equipment, Inc., in the amount of $277,900.00.

CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS FOR SEPARATE CONSIDERATION

BF 28803  Request for Approval of Initial Contracts with State-Approved Providers of Supplemental Education Services (SES) as Required by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB)

Director Hardy asked how the most recent tutoring services have helped in student proficiency and learning. He also asked with the range of contract amounts if that was based on students served or number of people serving the students? How does inclusion of the newer service groups fit into the Strategic Plan.

The Superintendent stated that as the service is now set up and has been for years, she could not see how it could provide better service than could be provided by SPPS. These groups are contracted to provide an opportunity for families to go to an outside agency to obtain tutorial services. These are independent contractors and SPPS has no oversight of their teaching. It simply oversees numbers seen and served. Additionally, there has been no correlation made between the service received and an improvement in achievement. SPPS has been looking for ways to measure the value of the tutorial services and ways to improve the value to families.

The Director of Funded Services stated there are a number of pieces which must be factored in for these contracts each year. These include, the per pupil amount available for each tutoring voucher to low income families, changes based on the Title I allocation, the census poverty count for a district and the number of providers available. The amount is capped at $4.5 million or 20% of the Title I allocation. SPPS needs to bring the full list of initial providers to the Board since it does not know which providers families will choose until the time they are chosen. SPPS then amends the contracts to reflect those providers who are actually working with its families. SPPS has looked at historical enrollment patterns for existing providers. For new providers consideration is given to the model they are providing, their track record in other locations, and the kind of capacity they say they will have and make a judgment call in order to meet student needs. Providers are certified by the State and the State provides a list to SPPS to work with.

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:

• Does the District track the use of services and is there improvement for the students? Do the students return and use the same providers the following year? Response: SPPS has no formal reports on how students are doing if they are involved in SES services. It is the State’s responsibility to evaluate providers. Numerous studies have been done nationally on this issue and few studies show the program has provided measurable benefits for the students. There is a wide variety on services provided as well as charges made for students and time devoted to tutoring them.

• Are any of the providers making a real difference for students? Response: Families provide feedback and there have been some positive interactions and services. Some community providers are trying to leverage this in different ways so the District has on-going relationships with some of them. It is a challenging issue for some of the small providers to compete with national and multi-national organizations.

• This is about student achievement; do any of these providers show positive success with SPPS kids? Response: There are a handful that show some progress with students. There are a couple of providers who do on-line learning and are providing some benefits. Those that provide one-on-one tutoring seem to make the biggest difference for students.

• It was noted SPPS is getting very little return for spending 20% of its Title I allocations and it does cost in staff time for monitoring the providers. Additionally, some practices could be called into question. All in all there is no way to gauge student achievement from this service.

• The tutoring takes place during the school year? Yes

• Doesn’t the SPPS Foundation provide tutoring? How does that fit together? Response: There is no relationship between the SPPS Foundation and these providers. There is no mentoring with the SPPS Foundation, only tutoring. Some of the partners have also applied
to the State to be SES providers so they provide tutoring for both but one is not dependent upon the other.

**MOTION:** Ms. Carroll moved, seconded by Mr. Hardy, the Board of Education authorizes Superintendent Valeria Silva to enter into agreements with the above-authorized SES providers for the school year 2011-2012.

The motion was approved by the following roll call vote:

- Brodrick: Yes
- Street-Stewart: Yes
- Carroll: Yes
- Risberg: Yes
- Hardy: Yes
- Kong-Thao: Yes
- O’Connell: Yes

**XI. OLD BUSINESS**

**BF 28804** Third Reading: Revision to Policy 903.00 Dangerous Weapons

Ms. Carroll indicated she would be voting no on this item, as she did not consider it an appropriate exception.

**MOTION:** Ms. O’Connell moved approval of the revisions to Policy 903.00 Dangerous Weapons as published. Motion seconded by Ms. Kong-Thao.

The motion was approved by the following roll call vote:

- Brodrick: Yes
- Street-Stewart: Yes
- Carroll: No
- Risberg: Yes
- Hardy: Yes
- Kong-Thao: Yes
- O’Connell: Yes

**XII. NEW BUSINESS**

**BF 28805** Minnesota Tax Aid Anticipation Bond Borrowing (MN TAAB)

The Chair stated this was a Resolution authorizing and awarding sale of General Obligation Aid Anticipation Certificates of Indebtedness, Series 2011C and fixing form and terms thereof in connection with the Minnesota Tax and Aid Anticipation Borrowing Program sponsored by the Minnesota School Board Association and Greater Minnesota Service Cooperatives.

**QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:**

- Because of the nature of this item administration was asked why this needs to be done, why it is the best method and the implications to the District? Response: MN TAAB is the lowest rate for borrowing that SPPS can get. SPPS has worked in collaboration with other school districts to get a favorable rate. This is required because of the aid shift occurring over the last three years starting at a 90/10 shift which is now down to 60/40. This is the legislature’s delaying of payments to the school districts. What the legislation does is tells districts what the State will give them based on demographic enrollment and all of the other formulas associated with it. There is also the District’s cash flow which must be met in order to keep the District solvent. The final factor is to keep the cost of borrowing to the District as low as possible.

- In making this borrowing, does that max out any future possible borrowings from MN TAAB? Will there be a need for additional borrowing beyond this? Response: Administration is anticipating another potential to borrow in the Spring, possibly in April or May. The District is exploring various possibilities such as a line of credit option as a safety measure. SPPS is still evaluating that through different banks in Minnesota. Because of the 60/40 split,
opportunities will arise where a borrow is necessary. There is also the single borrow option on the District’s own accord. First and foremost is finding the lowest rate.

MOTION: Ms. Carroll moved the Board of Education approve the Resolution authorizing and awarding sale of General Obligation Aid Anticipation Certificates of Indebtedness, Series 2011C and fixing form and terms thereof in connection with the Minnesota Tax and Aid Anticipation Borrowing Program sponsored by the Minnesota School Board Association and Greater Minnesota Service Cooperatives. The motion was seconded by Ms. O’Connell.

The motion was approved by the following roll call vote:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brodrick</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street-Stewart</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carroll</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risberg</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardy</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kong-Thao</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O’Connell</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

XIII. BOARD OF EDUCATION

A. Information Requests & Responses - None

B. Items for Future Agendas - None

C. Board of Education Reports/Communications - None

XIV. FUTURE MEETING SCHEDULE

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

- November 15 – Special Closed Meeting – Labor Negotiations (4:30 p.m.)
- November 15
- November 29 – Special (Levy Hearing) (6:00 p.m.)
- December 7 – Special Closed Meeting – Superintendent Evaluation (3:00 p.m.)
- December 7 – Special Closed Meeting – Labor Negotiations (5:30 p.m.)
- December 13
- January 10, 2012 -- SPPS Annual Meeting (4:30 p.m.)
- January 17
- February 21
- March 20
- April 17
- May 15
- June 5 – Special (Non-Renewals) 4:00 p.m.
- June 19
- July 17
- August 21

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

- November 1
- November 29
- December 6
- January 10, 2012 -- 5:00 p.m.
- January 31
- March 6
- April 3
- May 1
- June 12
- July 17
The Chair noted the 2011 Election will be held on November 8, 2011.

XV. ADJOURNMENT

MOTION: Mr. Brodrick moved the meeting adjourn; seconded by Mr. Risberg.

The motion was approved by the following roll call vote:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brodrick</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street-Stewart</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carroll</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risberg</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardy</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kong-Thao</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O’Connell</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The meeting adjourned at 9:51 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