

**INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 625**  
**Saint Paul, Minnesota**  
**MINUTES OF THE SPECIAL MEETING OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION**  
**June 01, 2010**

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting was called to order at 4:45 p.m.

**II. ROLL CALL**

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

**III. ORDER OF THE AGENDA**

**MOTION: Mr. Brodrick moved approval of the Order of the Agenda. Motion seconded by Ms. Carroll.**

The motion passed with the following roll call vote:

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

**IV. NEW BUSINESS**

**A. Presentation of the Probationary Teacher Non-Renewals**

The Superintendent stated the action was for the non-renewal of 117 non-tenured teachers and 1 non-tenured principal. The number of non-renewals had decreased slightly as the District works to place people in available positions. The non-renewals fall into three categories: non-renewal due to budget: 95 FTEs, due to performance: 17 FTEs and due to licensure or other issues: six FTEs.

**MOTION:** Ms. Carroll moved, seconded by Ms. Varro, that the Board of Education approve the Non-Renewal of the Probationary Teachers and Principal as published in the June 1, 2010 Board Book.

**QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:**

- A Board member requested the Superintendent provide some background information on the non-renewal process and the categories non-renewals fall under. Response: The Superintendent provided a description of the process utilized in reaching the final non-renewal numbers/names. Those non-renewed for budgetary reasons are part of the \$27.2 million reduction the district had to make due to declining enrollment, flat dollars from the State, increasing costs of goods, services and staff and the ending of some Federal grants. Every school had fewer dollars with which to hire staff for the coming year. This group is eligible for rehire should positions become available and their application is successful. Individuals non-renewed for performance reasons are those teachers who did not perform at the standard level of District expectations even though

they were monitored closely and provided with supports to assist in improving their deficiencies. Individuals in this group are generally not recommended for rehire in the district.

- How was the District able, with a higher budget deficit, to have fewer people on the non-renewal list? Response: Two primary factors influenced the non-renewal numbers. First, the New Teacher Project was discontinued as part of the budget reduction effort. This enabled the district to retain 30-40 positions, which might have been cut. Secondly, the District created an early separation incentive to encourage early retirement. Currently 18 teachers and 2 TAs have taken advantage of this incentive that has also opened staff placements.
- Were there proportionately more teachers lost due to closings and relocations? Response: Not necessarily, when there is declining enrollment it will result in the need to reduce staff.
- Why such a large number of counselors on the list? Response: This is because many were hired on the same day so by practice they are released as a block. Some will be hired back though it is not known how many will come back at this time.
- The counselors' effective date is 6/22. Please clarify the tenure concept; if all these people are non-renewed and they are not rehired before 6/22 does their tenure count start all over again? Response: Yes. A probationary teacher is like any other probationary employee. If they are non-renewed, their annual contract ceases as of end of business June 30. If they are immediately rehired, there is no break in service. If they were not rehired until the next year, there would be a break in service. The State Statute requires the first three years of "continuous service." If they were hired back before the succeeding school year starts, there would be no break in service. Additional input stated Minnesota Statute defines probation as three consecutive years of service and during that probationary period individuals can be non-renewed for any reason (typically budget, performance, licensure and authorization to work in the U.S.). A probationary teacher is deemed hired for the following year unless provided with notice by July 1 of that year. If a non-renewal is due to performance, the District does not normally rehire those individuals. If it is due to budget people can be rehired as vacancies occur. There is also layoff, which is layoff of tenured staff. This will be brought forward at the June 15 Board meeting. These individuals have the right of recall to assignment. The three-year rule is applied by SPPS such that if you have been employed for three consecutive years at the point that they are rehired they are tenured. First or second year the process starts over again if they are hired after the ensuing school year has begun. If they are hired back before the ensuing year has begun, there is no break in service.
- Administration was instructed to provide clarification on these various non-renewal issues each year at the time non-renewals are brought forward.
- The non-renewals in Special Education how will that impact service delivery? Response: Some non-renewals were due to budget reduction, some were relative to student needs and changes in those areas may impact the needs in certain licensure areas.
- Why does the District begin layoffs with the newly employed teachers? Response: The District follows State law and this is the process as defined in State Statute. Additionally, replacements to the positions must be qualified and licensed for the specific area they are hired for; that is fundamental. Further clarification stated that the Teacher Tenure Act requires layoff by seniority there is no choice.
- How many probationary teachers have been kept and in particular how many of those are teachers of color and teachers of mobility assisted? Response: Administration indicated they could provide that information but not at this point.
- There are three TOSAs. Do TOSAs have a chance to get back into teaching pools? What is the District's philosophy on TOSAs vs. teaching in the classroom? Response: TOSAs are treated as any other classroom teacher and only if they have a specific skill or licensure may that affect them differently. The philosophy is that TOSAs are part of the District's design for professional development. The recent budget cuts cut many coaches. Some of the requirements the District has for professional development produces dollars from the State and that is how some staff are assigned to coaching

positions because that money is designated directly to be used for professional development. Coaches continue working with classroom teachers and working with students directly. In no case do TOSAs not work with students. The dollars the District gets from Title I and Professional Development have tails defining the time TOSAs work with adults and students.

- Does the district have probationary teachers coaching? Response: Yes, this could be an experienced teacher who has taught in other areas or who have been principals in other school districts. Coaching can be a requirement of licensure.

**RESTATEMENT OF MOTION:**

**Ms. Carroll moved, seconded by Ms. Varro, that the Board of Education approve the Non-Renewal of the Probationary Teachers and Principal as published in the June 1, 2010 Board Book.**

The motion passed with the following roll call vote:

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

**B. Personnel Transactions**

The Superintendent announced some principal changes for the 2010-11 school year.

- Barack and Michelle Obama Service Learning Elementary – Adrian Pendelton
- Bridgeview – Mark Vandersteen
- Highland Park Senior High School – Winston Tucker
- Maxfield Magnet - Nancy Stachel

**QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:**

- Will there be principals reporting to the Director of Turnaround Schools? Response: Yes, a small group of schools and their principals will report directly to the Director of Turnaround Schools. .
- What does that position do? The position provides the district the opportunity to focus more on schools with continuous poor test performance. The position comes directly from Title I dollars. The position will be funded out of a MDE grant associated with ARRA and Title I funds. It is a required position in order for the district to receive school improvement grants for Humboldt and Maxfield. It will serve as a liaison and work to streamline accountability for turnaround efforts being implemented at the schools.
- This position is specifically for those two schools. Response: The position will be proactive and there are some other schools that will be identified to work with the Turnaround Director as well.

**MOTION: Ms. O'Connell moved, seconded by Ms. Carroll, that the Board of Education adopts the Superintendent's recommendations and in connection therewith appoint Andrew Collins to the Superintendency position of Director of Turnaround Schools to be effective July 1, 2010.**

The motion passed with the following roll call vote:

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

**V. OLD BUSINESS****A. Approval of the FY 11 Budget**

The Chief Business Officer provided a brief review of the budget development milestones, enrollment trends over the past five years, the FY 11 projected shortfall, a summary of the approved reductions made April 6 and April 20 which totaled a reduction of \$27,156,030. He went on to show the proposed FY 11 budget totaling \$623.8 million, which was broken out into the following funds:

- General Fund \$455.9 million
- General Fund Fully Financed \$57.6 million
- Food Service Fund \$22.8 million
- Community Service Fund \$19.4 million
- Community Service Fund Fully Financed \$2.8 million
- Building Construction \$26.0 million
- Debt Service \$39.3 million

He then outlined areas where the public could help which included:

- Turning in the free/reduced application, if eligible
- Contacting State elected officials and make their position known
- Participating in the fall elections as informed voters
- Advocating for SPPS with neighbors who do not have school age children
- Volunteering at SPPS schools
- Donating to the Saint Paul Foundation.

**QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:**

- A Board member stated there is a difference between approving the budget number and the Board understanding all of the details of all the plans, programs and staffing decisions that go into the budget. The Board has thoroughly reviewed everything that got it to the \$623.8 but it is not within the Board's purview to have all the details down to the individual classroom level. There are, however, a number of outstanding issues. Having made the motion she indicated she was prepared to vote in support of the budget figure. She went on that this does not construe satisfaction with this being the final answer on how elementary and secondary music will be handled. She requested an overview of the process being followed and the timeline on where the music issues go from today.
- The Chair noted the Board is obligated to present a balanced budget to the State. Implementation within program areas, personnel, departments, assessments and the consequences of assessments is a matter for administration with scheduled opportunities for the Board to look at revisions to the budget.
- The Superintendent stated there needed to be clarifications between music education and itinerant instrumental music/band. The District offers music instruction in the schools. Every school gets a budget and determines how they will use their dollars. The District, in the past, had centralized dollars it provided to schools to have itinerant instrumental music instruction moving across schools. SPPS is the only district to provide that service at the elementary level. The reality is there is only so much money and the district can do only so much. The District can provide music instruction but it cannot provide the itinerant instrumental music opportunity during the school day. Administration was creative and found a way to provide instrumental music (4-6) in the schools before, after school, or on Saturdays. This is a work in progress. The District is committed to finding ways to provide students with many opportunities. The Board's charge to administration was to provide the opportunity for all students to be exposed to instrumental music before middle school. The Chief Academic Officer stated administration is working collaboratively with the itinerant music instructors to design a high quality program that meets standards. They are designing a new program to serve students before, after school, and on Saturdays. This is a time of possibilities and

administration is working to create a program to provide more access for all students with licensed teachers to provide the programming. Administration is working with ALC, HR and others to set up times for discussion. Community and arts organizations are being drafted to assist in the process. The St. Paul Schools Foundation is working to create a broader structure for the arts.

- The statement was made this has given the District the opportunity to work with the community and others to create partnerships and involve the entire broader community in achieving this end.
- What ideas have been presented to cover the needed \$750,000 cost savings and keep music during the school day? Response: The District is not being capricious in suggesting before and after school, this is the way the dollars to fund the program can be used. The money cannot come from general fund revenue. The majority of comments received were simply in support of keeping the program during the day. Suggestions included raising funds in some manner, donors/funders sponsoring schools, a fee base per student (which creates an equity issue). The District is pushing the public to go through the Foundation because there is the equity issue. Clarification points were made that (1) schools get their own budgets and can buy an allocation for itinerant instrumental music – this is entirely up to the school and school community. (2) The Foundation can address the equity issue by providing for families who cannot afford music instruction. The program costs \$550/student for 20 hours of instrumental music instruction per year. The Superintendent stated this is an issue that will come back onto the table in years to come due to continued budget deficits.
- Contact for the Foundation is their website: <http://www.sppsfoundation.org/>
- Concern was expressed that the new ALC after school program needs to be up and running in September. Who are the players? How will this work out as far as getting all the resources together? Response: Clarification was made that ALC instruction starts the second week in October and runs to three weeks before school ends. The dollars are provided for ALC in this timeframe. This provides 96.5 additional hours of instruction for each student. There is a very capable team working to make it happen and it will be effective if people work to make it so and do not undermine it.
- The Superintendent stated the district needs to start looking at things differently, it needs to move to zero based budgeting. She stated the District is committed to the arts and to a well-rounded education. The enrichment portion is new to ALC. A position has been created for a TOSA to design programs that meet the needs of the schools. A scope and sequence of what the music program will look like will be created. Another area that will be looked at is how to create a foundation in music from K-6 so students have a musical base when they reach the middle school level.
- The June 14 meeting is for all K-12 music educators. The next one would be opened to other stakeholders, music educators and community arts organizations.
- An update on the swimming pools was requested. Response: The Cherokee community has not provided any additional requests or ideas. What about Murray? The Superintendent stated there is an issue with equity, which is why the District chose to keep pools at the high schools open and cut at the other pools. There is a need to think on a bigger picture and decide where to invest in what programs and put resources there.
- A Board member stated he would vote yes on the budget. He expressed disappointment on the music issue but encouraged administration as it moves forward with the ALC music program to aim for the best quality possible and use the showcases next spring to show that St Paul still makes great programs happen in SPPS.
- The stakeholder conference how will participants be notified? Administration will be creating a committee with identified existing partners who will develop the plan.

**MOTION: Ms. Carroll moved, seconded by Ms. Varro, that the Board of Education approved the FY 11 budget in the total amount of \$623.8 million.**

The motion passed with the following roll call vote:

Ms. Carroll	Yes
Mr. Hardy	Yes

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

## VI. ADJOURNMENT

**MOTION: Mr. Hardy moved the meeting adjourn. Motion seconded by Ms. O'Connell.**

The motion passed with the following roll call vote:

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

The meeting adjourned at 6:36 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