

**MEETING MINUTES  
COMMITTEE OF THE BOARD MEETING  
February 11, 2020**

PRESENT: Board of Education: J. Foster, J. Kopp, J. Brodrick, C. Allen, S. Marchese, M. Xiong

Z. Ellis arrived at 4:48 p.m.

SEAB: M. Raymond

Staff: Superintendent Gothard, M. Hoerth, H. Hass, L. Erickson, N. Logan, M. Gilbert Dougherty, K. Kimani, K. Cordes-Sween, T. Walker, H. Kilgore, N. Zimmer, B. Natala, E. Levinson, M. Schrul, K. Thao, C. Long, C. Baker, D. Watkins, J. Turner, Y. Vang, M. Doud, B. Chan, K. Burns, J. Engen, K. Randall, S. Bonnick, A. Childs, J. Bjoraker, S. Butler, A. Macias, P. Bookhat, N. Perez, B. Reyes, S. Dahlke

Other: M. Vanderwert, T. Maki, R. Noecker, T. Lonetree, J. Verges, F. Dietz

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting was called to order at 4:33 p.m.

**II. AGENDA**

**A. Superintendent's Announcements**

Superintendent Gothard began the meeting by welcoming board members, community, and staff, and SEAB Member Raymond.

He noted that it is the start of the legislative session at the Capitol, and noted the special education cross-subsidy, as well as the general education revenue fund that has adjusted with inflation since 2003, and the resulting \$25M gap in funding. He also reviewed other items on the SPPS legislative agenda, such as increase and diversify the teacher workforce, enhance taxpayer equity, enhance local control and reduce mandates, and provide resources for child and family stability and support. He also noted it is a non-funding year, and the momentum within the metro and beyond to look at our state of education and how we can organize ourselves to speak with one voice to ensure we can sustain what we all strive to do – excellence in education for students and families. The sessions ends on May 18<sup>th</sup>, and urged all to learn more about the events and the Capitol and to join session activities and continue to support SPPS and public schools in the state of Minnesota.

**B. SEAB Report**

SEAB Member Raymond provided an update on their current projects, and frustration of members in trying to complete their 4 Es – including Ethnic Studies project, community engagement with SEAB, engaging LEAP students, and engaging student voice in board decisions. SEAB members wish to build a better bridge between the Board and SEAB, and noted the experience of the group this year. SEAB Member Raymond noted the Ethnic Studies Stakeholder Group, and wishes for SEAB to be involved in collaborating with those members.

Board members requested information on how to help them with community engagement, with SEAB Member Raymond noting that he can bring that back to the group for further discussion. Superintendent Gothard noted that he will ensure SEAB's voice is present in the Ethnic Studies stakeholder group and will follow-up with staff. Director Foster noted her frustration by the lack of student voice in the stakeholder group, and requested further dialogue around that item, because we need authentic engagement and the recommendation for ethnic studies was brought forth by students, and the plan should contain student voice.

### C. City of Saint Paul 3K

Superintendent Gothard then welcomed Saint Paul Councilmember Rebecca Noecker to share updates on the 3k program in Saint Paul, and joining our staff in all facets of this work. He also noted former board member, Mary Vanderwert, for her work as well.

#### **Mission**

- To coordinate and expand access to high quality early learning to 3 and 4-year-olds in Saint Paul, so that all children are ready for kindergarten and all families can thrive.

#### **The Need**

- Minnesota is the **4th most expensive** state for childcare\*
- **34%** of Saint Paul's 3 and 4-year-olds live below the Federal Poverty Line
- **74%** live below 300% of the Federal Poverty Line
- Scholarships do not cover the full cost of care and only provide access to children below 185% of poverty
- In Ramsey County, 471 families are on waiting lists for child care assistance
- Of preschool seats in community providers, **4586 are unrated by Parent Aware**
- FAST data shows areas of growth needed for kindergarten among 56% of children

#### **Strategy**

1. Create a blueprint
2. Create a leadership structure
3. Build the framework
4. Build the political will

#### **Work to Date**

- 2017
  - Saint Paul Children's Collaborative (SPCC) Board direct staff to prepare a blueprint for city-wide early learning
  - SPCC convenes stakeholders
  - Saint Paul 3K Blueprint accepted by SPCC in October
- 2018
  - Steering Committee of policymakers convened in March
  - Contracted with Project Manager in April
  - Design team began work in November
- 2019
  - Community engagement with families and providers
  - Contracted with communications firm
  - Final design report submitted at the end of December

#### **Partners**

- Steering Committee members, Design Team, and Financial Subcommittee members were recognized.

- SPPS members included Superintendent Gothard, Mary Vanderwert, Lori Erickson, Arleen Schilling, and Marie Schrul.

### **Community Engagement**

- Outreach Parents and Providers
  - Conversations, listening sessions, online survey
  - Reached over 75 providers and 250 families

### **Program Design**

- Program Elements
  - Mixed delivery system, including Saint Paul Public Schools, charter schools, Head Start, child care centers, and licensed family child care providers
  - Quality metrics and support
  - Common application and enrollment system
  - Full funding for families at 300% of FPL and below.
  - Consistent evaluation of programs
- Outstanding Questions
  - Quality Standards
  - Wrap-around Services
  - Governance
  - Financing Mechanism
  - Family Friend and Neighbor Care

### **Next Steps**

- 2020
  - Build the coalition
  - Organize families and providers
  - "Make it Real"
  - Raise funds
  - Prepare for 2021 legislative session

### **QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:**

- There was a question from an audience member on the quality standards piece, and quality in early learning programming about teaching and learning within the program, and ensuring it is culturally specific, and its relation to Parent Aware. The balance in quality needs to be safe space, emotionally caring, and food, as well as teaching and learning.
- What conversations are happening for children that attend family, friend or neighbor care? Many of our children of color do not attend care within the system or licensed care, but go to family members or friends. We need to find a way to validate how those families and communities are teaching and nurturing their children and provide connections to not create further gaps between groups of students, and support available for them. What are the conversations around quality piece being balanced between DHS and MDE? In talking about quality how are we reaching children not in licensed care where quality is equally valuable because it is culturally specific and language specific, and value specific. Where is their support to continue what they are doing? Response: These concerns and question mirror similar conversations. These concerns will require further dialogue. These points are spot on and feedback from providers about quality standards and deficiencies in Parent Aware, and we don't want to replicate systems, but build upon and leverage them. We also don't want to replicate a system that isn't working. We are hoping this new entity will be a new voice advocating for kids in St. Paul and providers and families to DHS and MDE for changes they are interested in making to Parent Aware. The decision to expand this to all licensed providers was the most controversial. The discussion was about how the goal is to get as many providers as possible to the scale to quality, and the best ways to do that and options for that. The point about family friend and neighbor care are the conversations we still need to have and how do we

do that because this is going to reach all kids in Saint Paul and there needs to be family, friend and neighbor care in the conversation. The lieutenant governor also asked similar questions.

- Director Kopp noted similar questions, and to build on scaling up the quality, are we engaging with those in different sizes of child care systems and family, friend and neighbor care and how that looks different. Are those folks now or will be included in conversations in ways to scale up in a way that meets their timeline? Are we asking people to move at the same pace not reasonable and how will they be included in the conversation? Response: Yes, they need to be included in the discussion as well. One way of engagement is designing the one stop shop, and building relationships. There is mistrust and groups that have felt, historically, they were not engaged or there was an adversarial relationship. They will absolutely be a part of the conversation. We asked the design team to take the blueprint to a more fine grain level of planning and came back with that so much depends on how much funding there is and timing. Asking them to imagine a certain level of detail was difficult. We also need to build the public will around this idea, even if the details are still murky, something we need to invest in and get resources. Other cities have had implementation planning time, and build relationships to get to those specific questions.
- There was a note about students with special needs, and rich conversations if entities are getting public funding, there is an obligation to include students with special needs, and funding streams and the extra costs around supports for students with special needs and how that may be built into the funding, because we're mandated to provide those supports and will continue to offer those. As we see more funding for early learning, and we are finding more students who need the early intervention, which is a good thing, and also how to financially support it.
- CM Noecker noted she really admires and respects the district partnerships with providers, and has been great to work with staff about wealth of knowledge and will need to continue to work together –we want this to be mutually beneficial.
- There was another note that this is an amazing opportunity for our city. Everybody who has concerns is together in this – city, county, school district, and providers. If we do it right, and follow the research, build a system that works for families and for children, this can be a model for the whole state. It will take courageous leadership and commitment of resources to make it happen. Early childhood is different because of the need to support families, early interventions services, health services, and smaller class sizes, and the qualifications for a quality system. The resources with higher education institutions were also noted and collaboration to build skills and qualifications. This is an exciting opportunity and will make a world of difference for our youngest learners both in early education, but also throughout their entire life. Urged support and commitment of resources to make it happen.
- CM Noecker noted that we couldn't make a better economic development in our human capital - this is the type of program that yields return on investment and is excited for first city in region with starting at 3 access to free or highly subsidized quality early education and the attraction of people to move to Saint Paul and the impacts of this program to the city as a whole and attracting new residents. She also noted this is designed for 3-4 year olds, but have had conversations about 0-3, and 0-5, and conversation with the County about their home visits program, and college savings account program – those will dovetail to serving 3-4 year olds. If the state decides to fully fund programming for 3-4 year olds, we will move the model for 2-3 year olds. We are flexible about the approach, and not letting the state off the hook, but not willing to wait either.
- Director Allen noted concerns from the perspective of African Descendants of Slaves, and in speaking about the different groups within communities and the broken relationships happened with the schools and harm. We need to go through a repair process before people are willing to put their children into a space to be able to process the situations they encounter in schools systems. In talking about getting people on board, it important to have the right people at the table to understand the communities before we reach out to them, and with the city, county and state and different entities and to the different communities, and concerns about what it means. Special education and evaluation, and access to earlier evaluation of students which proves to put disproportionate numbers of African American student in to special education services. Those are real concerns. She challenged the people making decisions and to go into communities and bring those folks to the table to have conversations about their needs. If we don't the program will not work and not get the impact intending.

- Director Marchese was glad to hear talk about if the state funds pre k slots. Think one of the concerns is letting the stat off the hook that people have been pushing. Efforts at the state to be more responsive to 3-4 year olds. Because there is funding for scholarships, as we think about the different sources of revenue. When you looked at the cost estimate of \$25M, is there a sense of what it comes out to be? \$20M for actual to pay of providers? Does it include training and professional development, increase demand for services? Are those embedded in that? Is the sales tax – one way to address this, but that's going to be a long term ask of the state, and the question if the legislature opportunity to do this. Are there other ways? Response: To how far the \$20M goes, it was an informed estimate. Metrics IQ has done this for numerus other cities and good sense of uptick. Not every student will automatically take advantage of this. Many will opt to keep their children in family, friend and neighbor care and not enroll their kids. They estimated that \$20M includes 20% for administrative costs, quality supports, and some overhead, the majority of it is the tuition support. That's where the need is. If there are other solutions. We have looked at every option, and open to others one challenge is that cities are limited to raise revenue aside from property tax. We need to go to the state for approval for all others. Each requires state approval. we have looked at parking surcharge, soda tax – many also require legislative approval and don't yield the resources needed.
- There is already a fair amount of funding that comes into city for funding. Head Start, VPK, child care assistance sliding scale, and could be integrated into this. The city wouldn't have to not bear full cost and could be blended. As this becomes a system, money funneled to kid and less administrative costs and less other personnel. There are opportunities to make what we have more efficient and more relevant to kids.
- Director Brodrick noted not taking action on this presentation. like to hear form other board members and Superintendent and CM Noecker, what could see as possible action that board could take on this down the road? Response: For the district, continue to serve on steering committee and design committee and continue to work with CN Noecker, and keep our work alive; it has been 2.5 years and also do it in a way the respects the position of CM Noecker as it relates to funding decisions and steps. We need to coordinate our efforts moving forward in work at the capital, work with the sales tax if that's an opportunity. Can see this is regular report, and report back to the board as it moves forward.
- In the meantime, this district is going to be very supportive of this project? Response: We will continue to serve on the steering committee, and many topics continue to wrestle with in the plan. Extent to which Superintendent and staff are involved, no reason to stop what we've done if there is still work to be done. In terms of if we can implement this program, decision is out of our hands in permission to authority and vote.
- As a board member, looking for moment of truth when district would come on board as part of the initiative? Response: Ultimately the city is leading this work, and decisions at the city table, there hasn't been a formal ask to be a part of a formal coalition – but will be making that ask in the future. This is something we need to do together and do for kids. This was a preview with more to come.

#### D. Fiscal Year 2019-2020 Budget Revision

Superintendent Gothard then introduced Marie Schrul, Chief Finance Officer, and Kimberly Cordes-Sween, Senior Budget Analyst, to present information regarding the FY2019-2020 budget revision. There will be a review of Revenue Changes – All Funds, Expenditure Changes – All Funds, Fully Financed Funds, and a recommendation for approval of the revision.

#### **FY20 Budget Revision**

(All Funds – Revenue Changes)

| <b>Funds</b>              | <b>Adopted Budget</b> | <b>Revision</b> | <b>Revised Budget</b> |
|---------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------|-----------------------|
| General Fund              | \$ 578,626,651        | \$ (4,448,658)  | \$ 574,177,993        |
| General<br>Fully Financed | 45,701,678            | 15,127,017      | 60,828,695            |

|                                     |                       |                      |                       |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|
| Food Service                        | 29,245,500            | 0                    | 29,245,500            |
| Community Service                   | 23,105,757            | 0                    | 23,105,757            |
| Community Service<br>Fully Financed | 6,055,136             | 281,765              | 6,336,901             |
| Building Construction               | 150,000,000           | 0                    | 150,000,000           |
| Debt Service                        | 43,573,599            | 0                    | 43,573,599            |
| <b>Total Revenue</b>                | <b>\$ 876,308,321</b> | <b>\$ 10,960,124</b> | <b>\$ 887,268,445</b> |

#### **FY20 Budget Revision**

(General Fund – Revenue Changes)

| <b>Description</b>                                                          | <b>Amount</b>  |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|
| Decrease of General Education Aid due to enrollment decline (as of 9/20/19) | \$ (4,448,658) |

#### **FY20 Budget Revision**

(All Funds - Expenditure Changes)

| <b>Fund</b>                         | <b>Adopted Budget</b> | <b>Revision</b>      | <b>Revised Budget</b> |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|
| General Fund                        | \$ 578,626,651        | \$ 11,286,988        | \$ 589,913,639        |
| General Fund<br>Fully Financed      | 45,701,678            | 15,127,017           | 60,828,695            |
| Food Service                        | 29,245,500            | 0                    | 29,245,500            |
| Community Service                   | 23,176,325            | 0                    | 23,176,325            |
| Community Service<br>Fully Financed | 6,055,136             | 281,765              | 6,336,901             |
| Building Construction               | 67,006,42             | 4,790,572            | 71,796,998            |
| Debt Service                        | 44,146,984            | 0                    | 44,146,984            |
| <b>Total Expenditures</b>           | <b>\$ 793,958,700</b> | <b>\$ 31,486,342</b> | <b>\$ 825,445,042</b> |

#### **FY20 Budget Revision**

(General Fund – Expenditure Changes)

| <b>Description</b>                                                                                           | <b>Amount</b>       |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|
| FY19 Assigned Fund Balance for FY20 Personalized Learning Through Technology (PLTT) expenditures             | \$3,260,999         |
| FY19 Assigned Fund Balance for Contractual Obligations/Purchase Order encumbrances that carried over to FY20 | 2,079,021           |
| FY19 Assigned Fund Balance for Site and Program carryover for planned FY20 expenditures                      | 1,937,365           |
| FY19 Professional Growth contractual balances carried over to FY20                                           | 311,420             |
| Pre-K and Voluntary Pre-K site adjustments                                                                   | 1,147,123           |
| Other School & Program adjustments                                                                           | 2,551,060           |
| <b>Total General Fund Revisions</b>                                                                          | <b>\$11,286,988</b> |

#### **FY20 Budget Revision**

(Building Construction Fund – Expenditure Changes)

| Description                                                       | Amount              |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|
| Revised for Purchase Order encumbrances that carried over to FY20 | \$ 8,484,598        |
| Reduction of Contingency                                          | (3,694,026)         |
| <b>Total Building Construction Fund Revisions</b>                 | <b>\$ 4,790,572</b> |

**FY20 Budget Revision**

(Fully Financed Funds – Revenue and Expenditure Changes)

- Revision on Fully Financed funds reflects the approval of grants under \$500,000 that were not adopted in FY20, as well as revisions to adopted grants and entitlements

| Description                               | Revenue       | Expense       |
|-------------------------------------------|---------------|---------------|
| General Fully Financed Increase           | \$ 15,127,017 | \$ 15,127,017 |
| Community Service Fully Financed Increase | \$ 281,765    | \$ 281,765    |

**QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:**

**RECOMMENDED MOTION:** Mr. Brodrick moved, seconded by Ms. Xiong and Ms. Allen, to approve the revised budget for fiscal year 2019-2020. The motion passed by acclamation.

**QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:**

- What happens to the overage? Does it forward to the next within the assigned fund balance in personalized learning? Response: Within our budget, we have fund balance when we close out the fiscal year. The intent is we have items we plan for within our budget for the next fiscal year. Sometimes we have restricted categories. In the case of personalized learning, there was MacBook and iPad sale 2 years ago, which intentionally assigned fund balance to reinvest within that area. Over the course of last year and this year, the personalized learning department is planning on investing dollars in that area in staffing and infrastructure. They are utilizing those resource within this fiscal year. These are planned expenditures and what fund balance is intended for and intended for a purpose.
- Director Allen noted that if there is an overage on that – why not invest into more apps the kids could use in the classroom or access like hot spots? Want to see more dollars, and hoping those dollars going directly to students, and expanding that. IT is really important, and trainings about how to use the computer during instruction time, and so many ways to use it and like to see if it directly impact to students. That a lot of money that could impact our students.
- Chief Schrul also noted these figures are for FY20. As we look ahead to FY21, we need to be strategic about what we are planning in our budget. We are going through a priority based budget project right now and meeting in upcoming weeks. As look at trend of enrollment, the trend of enrollment was a decline. That enrollment decline will impact what planning on for next year's revenue. As we are going into next few months and look at options and budget, everything builds off prior year budget and can see trends and be strategic about what doing as district. Revenue looks flat, and mindful of what we're doing overall as a district. It's important to see projections in a couple weeks for current year and where we are landing.

**III. ADJOURNMENT**

It was motioned to adjourn the meeting at 5:49 p.m. The motion passed by acclamation.

#### **IV. WORK SESSION**

The Board and Administration then conducted a work session to further discuss items related to capital planning project plan presentation, factors to renovate versus replace at Bruce Vento Elementary, American Indian Magnet School, and Frost Lake Elementary, and gate checks for upcoming projects.

Respectfully submitted,  
Sarah Dahlke  
Assistant Clerk