

**MEETING MINUTES  
COMMITTEE OF THE BOARD MEETING  
February 5, 2019**

PRESENT: Board of Education: J. Foster, J. Schumacher, M. Xiong, J. Brodrick, M. Vanderwert

Z. Ellis arrived at 5:38 p.m.

S. Marchese arrived at 5:53 p.m.

Staff: Superintendent Gothard, J. Atkins, J. Jonassen, M. Hoerth, M. Dols Klingel, H. Ott, C. Mahaney, K. Cordes-Sween, S. Braithwaite, L. Erickson, A. Schilling, M. Doud, J. Vollmer, K. Keller, H. Kilgore, J. Engen, K. Wilcox-Harris, C. Long C. Baker, D. Watkins, M. Schrul, L. Sayles-Adams, E. Agbamu, A. Collins, K. Burns, M. Yackley, A. Corey, L. Olson, S. Dahlke

Other: J. Schultz, T. Baker, T. Lonetree, J. Verges, K. O'Connor, M. Maloney, E. Jablonie, A. van Oosterom

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting was called to order at 4:42 p.m.

**II. AGENDA**

A. Superintendent's Announcements

Superintendent Gothard welcomed everyone to the meeting. He thanked everyone for their hard work in communicating to families and supportive staff to keep everyone safe during last week's weather delays and closures. Due to the weather again, schools that normally end at 2:00pm will end a half hour earlier to help with the transportation tiers. The State of the District has been rescheduled to Wednesday, February 13 beginning at 8:00am at Washington Tech. He is excited to be with students, staff and community for this event, and invitations have been sent. He noted that a resolution to withdraw and terminate the Joint Powers Agreement with the City and County will be brought to the February 19, 2019 regular meeting, and he will keep the Board regularly updated on these efforts. On February 28<sup>th</sup>, he will join Mayor Carter and Commissioner McDonough at a press conference to speak on the shared desire to terminate the agreement. The City Council and County Board will also be acting on similar resolutions. Throughout the process, we heard many concerns from the community. We remain committed to working together for our youth. He recognized members of staff, especially Chief of Staff Cedrick Baker, for their work in these efforts. Superintendent Gothard went on to update the Board on SPPS Achieves and the symbolic leadership. He shared the SPPS Achieves pin with board members and provided a quote on change. We are organized for action to change our long-term student outcomes. He also thanked Kate Ryan in Communications for creating this graphic.

B. Investment Report

Chief Financial Officer, Marie Schrul, then introduced representatives from Wells Fargo and US Bank to provide an update on SPPS investments. Reports are available for more details on the investments.

**Wells Fargo**

- John Schultz and Todd Baker, representatives from Wells Fargo, provided an overview of the OPEB trust, which is a trust that was opened in 2011 for Other Post Employment Benefit investments.
- He recapped the OPEB trust, which is a trust set up for promises made to teachers having to do with health benefits. With health benefits now being more expensive, the promises ballooned, and there is a liability of \$331M for teachers and all bargaining units that had promises, which is about 27 or 28 units, with teachers being the main bargaining unit. This is an ongoing liability.
- A trust was set up and has been funded over time. The balance today is approximately \$31M. We are starting to make contributions to the trust with a planned contribution of \$500,000 this year.
- He noted a summary of the key items of portfolio. This is money managed under a state statute. This liability is a long-term liability, and opened the investment options to many types; long term better rate of return. The obligation is \$331M at this time, and the objective is a moderate growth and income portfolio, with a highly diversified strategy – a four asset class strategy. At the core of this strategy is investing in a way to get a desired rate of return with the least amount of risk.
- Page 7 notes the changes to the portfolio. Mid-year last year, we reduced the high yield corporate bonds. That money was moved to investment grade bonds, which are safer, and return of principle is highly likely. The unfortunate aspect is that safe short-term investments are paying low interest rates currently. It was a move toward safety.
- In September and October, there were volatile markets. After decline, the portfolio manager sold public REAT allocations, which were up for the year, and moved those to stocks. Those are the two most recent shifts. The bottom pie charts show overall, we are close to target allocations or target amount of risk, slightly overweight on stocks, which are more growth oriented, and slightly overweight in fixed income, which is the safe part of the portfolio.
- The performance over the last three years was also noted, which shows that three years ago we were at \$30.6M, and there has been \$1M in contributions and about \$4M in gains, which puts us at \$35.9M currently. The rate of return shows it has been 4.47. He then highlighted the four types of investments. In the safe short term part of the portfolio, it has been 1.49% over the last three years, which is low and very unusual. Short-term yields have come up, but are still low. The riskiest part is stocks, in the last 3 years, that portion has averaged 7.31%. It is still the best performing part of the portfolio. There was \$22M added in 2017. It is a meaningful portion of the portfolio. Real assets have done well at 6.98%. Alternative investments are designed to reduce volatility and lower correlation, which is yielding 1.5%.
- It's performing well given the market environment.

#### **QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:**

- What is the market average and how do we stack up against others? Response: Within the report, there are benchmarks under each of the categories to compare to within that category. The only item with the absolute comparison not as pure is that funds have been coming in over time. While adding funds, it can make the comparison more difficult.
- As trade talks escalate and the trade deficit widens with China, should we in SPPS be worried about China? Response: The investment committee believes that there are two big things that are moving the market around at the end of last year were the US economy and the Chinese economy. The US economy is the largest in the world, and if we are having issues, that will have an impact all over. At the same time, China's economy has been slowing down. It has the lowest GDP rate for many years. If they slow down, it would have a negative impact. Our investment committee does not believe a recession is likely for this year. They felt strongly the market had overreacted. The trade negotiations do tend to be a drag on economic activity if they cannot be resolved long term. China's most favored nation status is being worked out, even though they are the second largest economy. These are massive changes in economic world of trading agreements.
- In looking at the consolidated portfolio, it looks like we have a couple in international? Response: Yes, those that may be in Chinese companies are in the emerging market portion. Why is China with the second largest economy still in the emerging market, and that is because one identification states that 20% or more are living below the poverty level. Our investment committee for the first time since the end of 2000 has the highest rating on emerging marketing stocks going forward. In the SPPS portfolio, it is relatively small for the risk tolerance.
- At what point does the US become an emerging market, with the poverty level? Response: The US came out of WW2 with economic dominance, and we hope to never go into the emerging market again.

By an investment perspective, we don't think we are a true definition, and don't think we will see it in these working years.

**US Bank**

- This is a reserve account that is safe. It is for security. It's a US government security. It is at the low range end of return and its purpose is to be there in case of emergency.
- On page 4, it shows that for the one-year period, it was up 1.49%, and follow it to the fixed income of 1.45, and in the ballpark of the benchmark.
- At 2 years, we are up 1.26, with a total fixed income of 123. Total cash was up 116. With the Fed raising interest rates, cash is paying money now.
- Three years, up 111, and inception to date up 1%.
- The actual cash flow can be seen on page 5. In July 2018, there was a small contribution of \$205,380 with a gain of \$174,527, to end at 25.9M for the period ending 12/31.
- This is secure money, and the goal is not to take risks. This is for liquidity and safety. The yield to maturity is 2.5. The average credit quality is AAA, and is pristine. There are actual bonds in here, and out 1-3 years. There has been another withdrawal of \$25M. The purpose for these funds is to be there when needed.
- We expect the Fed to raise interest rates one to two times this year. We are getting roughly 250 on the yield of the portfolio and expect that to rise somewhat as the Feds raise rates. The one concerning item is the yield curve is starting to invert – higher rate on shorter securities.
- The economy is strong and if employment stays strong, and should be able enhance the yield on the portfolio.
- The inverted yield curve does not happen often. The market participants are saying the Fed has done too much too fast, and we are forecasting that there will be a slowdown in 1-2 years. They are doing quantitative tightening of Fed monetary policy, and raising rates, which caused the yield curve to invert.
- It allows the investor to invest short-term securities than the long-term securities, and is actually flat. It may foretell a slowdown in the economy about two years down the road. This works out well for reserve accounts.
- On the China topic, there may be a worry on intellectual property and could impact our students and jobs.

**QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:** None

C. Kindergarten Readiness

Superintendent Gothard then introduced Lori Erickson, Assistant Director of the Office of Early Learning, and Sue Braithwaite, Supervisor for K-12 Literacy. This is an areas that is called out in the long-term student outcomes of SPPS Achieves, and SPPS has a leadership role in state in this area, and is a beneficiary of many grants in state. Saint Paul has been a leader in early education for the past 10 years and was one of the first to go to all-day kindergarten in the state. It was a change in learning culture, and one that continues today. We also have great partners and in the Innovation Grant to help us specifically in child-parent centers, and grants to help the alignment between PreK, K, 1, 2, and 3. Hans Ott and Megan Dols Klingel were also recognized for their work.

**How We Teach Literacy: Framework**

Pre-K	Elementary	Middle	High School
ECIPs*	2010 Common Core Standards Driven		
Early Childhood Workshop	Readers and Writers Workshop		Universal Themes
Student Voice, Use of Technology, Cultural Proficiency			

\*Early Childhood Indicators of Progress

### **Pre-K Enrollment 2017-2018**

- Pre-K Enrollment: 1865
  - 264 Students in State Funded Pre-K (Voluntary Pre-K)
  - 1336 Students in District Funded Pre-K
  - 265 ECSE Students in Pre-K Classrooms

### **Assessments**

- IGDI Suite (Individual Growth and Development Indicators)
  - Pre-K
    - Concepts of Print
    - Letter Name
    - Letter Sounds
    - Rhyming
    - Alliteration
    - Name Writing

### **Pre-K Literacy Proficiency – IGDI Suite (2017-2018)**

- Fall: 19%
- Winter: 44%
- Spring: 63%
- The percentages of students Not Yet Proficient, In Progress, and Proficient were then reviewed for both Full Day and Half Day Pre-K. The trends showed that the numbers of students Not Yet Proficient decreased throughout the year, while increasing in Proficient.
- The proficiency rate from Fall to Spring was a dramatic increase. Math has the most dramatic gains.

### **Pre-K Literacy Growth – IGDI (2017-2018)**

- Full Day
  - Fall-Winter: 25%
  - EOY: 48%
- Half Day
  - Fall-Winter: 25%
  - EOY: 43%
- Program
  - Fall-Winter: 25%
  - EOY: 44%

### **Next Steps**

- Full implementation of Work Sampling System (WSS) – overall umbrella to focus on whole child; well on the way to achieving 78% proficiency in our five-year goal
- Bi-weekly coaching using WSS and IGDI Suite (worksheet at the end of every assessment that is emailed to teachers that shows discreet skills; used heavily in coaching; disaggregated data, color coded so it is clear)
- Develop WIDA Early Years Framework (World Class Instructional Design and Assessment)
- Childcare Partnerships

### **Kindergarten Enrollment**

- Kindergarten Enrollment: 3124
  - Increase of 1% (44 Students)
- Special Needs Kindergarten: 364
- General Education: 2758

### **Assessments**

- earlyReading
  - K

- Fall:
  - Concepts of Print
  - Letter Name
  - Letter Sounds
  - Onset Sounds

### **Kindergarten Proficiency – FAST**

- High Risk: 29.7%
- Some Risk: 26.7%
- Low Risk: 43.6%
- It shows where they are with the benchmarks.

### **Kindergarten Literacy Proficiency – FAST**

- SPPS Pre-K
  - Low Risk: 41%
  - Some Risk: 30%
  - High Risk: 29%
- Not SPPS Pre-K
  - Low Risk: 46%
  - Some Risk: 24%
  - High Risk: 30%

### **Deeper Look – Kindergarten FAST Data**

Promising data suggests:

- Low Risk:
  - African American/Black
    - 37% Non SPPS Pre-K
    - 46% SPPS Pre-K
  - Asian
    - 25% Non SPPS Pre-K
    - 33% SPPS Pre-K
  - Hispanic
    - 33% Hispanic Non SPPS Pre-K
    - 29% SPPS Pre-K

### **Deeper Look – Kindergarten FAST Data**

Promising data suggests:

- Some Risk:
  - African American/Black
    - 29% Non SPPS Pre-K
    - 29% SPPS Pre-K
  - Asian
    - 26% Non SPPS Pre-K
    - 32% SPPS Pre-K
  - Hispanic
    - 29% Hispanic Non SPPS Pre-K
    - 37% SPPS Pre-K

### **Deeper Look – Kindergarten FAST Data**

Promising data suggests:

- High Risk:
  - African American/Black
    - 34% Non SPPS Pre-K
    - 26% SPPS Pre-K
  - Asian

- 48% Non SPPS Pre-K
- 35% SPPS Pre-K
- Hispanic
  - 38% Hispanic Non SPPS Pre-K
  - 34% SPPS Pre-K

### **Next Steps**

- Principal PD
- Monthly Coach/Lead Meetings
- CSI/TSI Coaching
- District Focus on Small Group Instruction

### **QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:**

- What is some context beyond our district for those percentages? These are kids that came into SPPS from non-SPPS PreK. Do we have an understanding of how we rate with other systems where kids go rather than SPPS? Response: It is something statewide that we do not have a great answer to. There is the Kindergarten Entry Profile, which less than 10% of the state participates in though. There was a 3K article referenced of the results for a PreK in North Carolina, which showed the African American students were outshining the others, which is also what we are seeing here.
- Is there a way to identify the students in Head Start? Response: Not yet, but we are working on getting closer to the structure of that data system. The data sharing that is happening with Head Start now is much closer than four years ago, and they are data systems that we are working through. Those students will have MARSS numbers, but it is an internal data entry type issue we are working through.
- Is there a way to compare numbers from a different schools district? Response: We are proud to look at the data with this strong of alignment, and with FAST and consistency to see results across the board, which is not occurring in other districts. This was the first time we were able to pull it and compare it.
- Do the children that arrive at kindergarten in SPPS, are they more prepared that those students who arrive at kindergarten in our adjoining districts? When they did the Kindergarten entry assessment, kids were at about 50% ready, and if we're at 43% low risk, then we are a little less probably.
- Should we be interested in comparison of districts? Response: There are a lot of variables to look at, and we are fortunate to have 1900 PreK seats, which is not happening in other districts. We are in year 3 of partnering with child cares, and have 12 under our belt, and it is a growing area and is difficult to compare. In terms of comparing with Minneapolis, it is similar but different; within SPPS we are proud that every site uses the IGDI suite, and that is not the case elsewhere when they may be using different tools across sites.
- How are we working with FAST data and using that data to work with families, and to bring them into the fold? How do we involve parents and how is the data different for those families versus those who may not have additional support? Response: Currently staff are working on sharing data in terms of how to inform instruction, and talk about the data. Staff have conferences with families and show that their child may need help in an area, and provide resources to help. Another area is communication, including SeeSaw, and to record skills and send to families has been extremely helpful. Home visits are also a time that teachers can bring the digital portfolio to see what their child is doing and learning.
- In looking at the data for our SPPS PreK students, is that inclusive of our partners? Response: That data is only for students at our programs at our current sites. However, our childcare partners have data, but are not necessarily using the IGDI suite or FAST. It looks different because our childcares may not have a packaged assessment.
- How does the data look like from full day sites to half-day sites? How does that show and support full day PreK? Response: Data was presented to the board that showed the differences, and the math achievement shows dramatic differences in our full day. The matriculation for full days is much stronger to have that continuity. Last year's matriculation data was 80% for half day and 86% for full day families.
- For the grant-funded parent-child centers, what kinds of outcomes did that produce? Response: The centers helped to provide information about academic life, and support for parents and families. They had components of family center on site that were participating at five schools in control group. Staff

traveled to Chicago to see an example, and replicated those in SPPS. The one main impact when looking at students across in lower class ratio centers, they had a year and a half gain compared to those other students who had a year gain. There were gains for those at the CPC. The struggle was around staffing and ratios. It helped us to build a case for 2 teacher to 20 four year olds, which is the methodology we currently use.

- Is there data for those students long-term? Response: We are tracking that right now. REA is working through that data within the district, and a longitudinal study, and looking at the students still at one of those five sites. Data is being collected. Jackson and Bruce Vento that celebrate, and how the feeling of those buildings have changed. There are 80 kids in PreK at Bruce Vento and they are thriving. The families feel like they belong.
- Director Vanderwert noted that in the data with 43% of kids coming into at low risk, it makes the case for ECFE. If less than 50% of kids are at low risk, that's a crisis, and our kids are capable of more than that, and we need to do better. Response: There are next steps in PreK relate to the K world.
- There is that larger conversation around memorization versus phonics, and what is that alignment and it sounds like there is more focus on phonics? How have we been doing it? It is uniform? Response: Currently we use Mondo Phonics materials, which are the district approved materials. Everyone has access to those, but the implementation varies by site. Some may have purchased their own which they feel are better.
  - Knowing that, can we track data on who is implementing with fidelity and what those school look like? Response: Currently we do not. That is the reason for Fast as a screener for K-5. Mondo Phonics has an assessment after every 30 lessons, but is not used consistently. With the new system, there will placeholder and checkpoints for if it is being taught with fidelity and what the data is telling us. There is also teacher buy-in, who may not choose to use Mondo Phonics based on the structure and framework. It assumes students come into kindergarten with proficiency, and moved from there, but there is not room for differentiation. Mondo was adopted 13 years ago, and we are having conversations around new materials, including surveys from teachers.
- Have we been committed to a phonics based reading philosophy for 13 years since we got Mondo, and when the teachers are giving feedback about what works and what doesn't, for those schools that are choosing not to use it, are they using other phonics based system? Do we have a unanimity of what how we teach reading? Response: There does need to be flexibility and building discretion for teaching, so when we talk about start, stop, sustain, there are long-term strategies to get us there, this is an opportunity to take the fidelity for items and look at where do we need to focus in on and go deep with practice on. Through the initiatives, we are getting to the point where we can prioritize and hold accountable to, and we have data systems to do them well. This is a time to recommit to the shared agreements, and use materials and curriculum that we all buy into, and incorporates the opinions of those who will use the materials. It is the right time to start, stop, sustain and go deeper. The piece that is not written is the connection to real life application. Phonics is one pillar of reading, and an important component for K-2, and it's always good to be connected to real life text. We're looking at a balanced approach with a focus on K-2 on phonics to decode words, and to also connect to text. At the PreK side, the active learning block and using the data sheet, the students need to connect the letters, and in context, and how phonics is taught in context. We have also been discussing issues around dyslexia, and there will be a welcome addition of the materials, and to bring into conversations for kids and how they learn.
- How do we standardize the things we are committed to so that parents and students understand that wherever they go, this is how they will be taught? Response: it's a major commitment on our part to this adoption, we need to make a commitment to build the culture of our district in understand and expectations. Decisions are made in buildings, and they may need support. If kids are struggling, we're going to do whatever it takes to find a solution. It comes from a place that we want it to work, and create support the district has for all teachers, buildings, and families. We need to go deeper. That's our commitment and supporting our work.
- What is the specific strategy for the kindergarten teacher is confronted with a group of kids of whom are ready to move to first grade, and a group who may struggle. Do we have specific strategies in place now that are better than in years past? When the strategic plan gets into motion, will those specific strategies to allow that teacher to help those specific kids? Will we be able to focus in on a specific student to help and support that student and teachers? We need to focus on the kids.

- In talking about assessments and curriculum with fidelity, and that teachers need the flexibility for individuality in the classrooms, we should not be doing something that we will not find good outcomes. Skilled folks are balancing that mix of standard items with the flexibility and individuality that teachers find will work for their kids. Fidelity is crucial in early education because we want to invest in items that will see the outcomes, and used in the manner for the ways we want to see the desired outcomes. There are individual things that all intersect together.
- What's going to change with the strategic plan in terms of early childhood? With the grant for PreK-3, to integrate strategies of early childhood to classrooms, and one way to address that kids can choose and individualize. What did we learn and how to we integrate what we learned? Response: With the McKnight work, we worked with them for six months and completed a full summary evaluation, with strengths and tumbling blocks. It is helpful information in doing things differently, and it was a successful grant and coaching. There were major stumbling blocks that we experienced, similar to other districts. The child parent center had focus on PreK-3, and was family based. The McKnight grant focused on PreK-3 early literacy and alignment with instruction. Some of the incredible successes were looking at the common language for PreK-K-1, with Wellstone and Saint Paul Music Academy, and we had third grade teachers that discovered commonalities, and those teachers didn't know how to approach it, and we were able to discuss and find commonality. Another area was in social/emotional, and about how the child is adapting to those changes and celebrate themselves and to self-regulate. There will be a solution kit in PreK and K classrooms, to go to the solution kit for those items, and finding success in PreK and K. Some work was also being brought to 1<sup>st</sup> grade, and kids are getting their own materials. It was a big win for the alignment purposes. The other layer is professional development for teachers, and coaching. There are 11 coaches supporting the PreK teachers, and when teachers are faced with a problem, they have a coach to help them figure it out or approach it together. Coaching and professional development are so helpful for teachers. SPPS.
- What are the qualifications for coaches? Response: Coaches are reading recovery trained, EL teachers, PreK-5 or PreK-6 licenses, 3 are bilingual, and are all recently out of the classroom and can relate to teachers.
- What is our role on how we are supporting our city with 4000 PreK students and serving 1900, and what is our role to support all PreK students? Response: 3K is one way. We would also like to bring on more childcares – we currently have 12. It's a fine balance. HeadStart is an example – that partnership through PD, and teaching strategies and assessment tool, that role and how we work together. We are closely aligned to ThinkSmall, who is connected with childcare centers and training. There is an Innocent Classroom for childcare providers. It is those partnerships that we can build upon and strengths, and for 3K, the design team and steering committee with the intent to create a blueprint for 3 and 4 year old programming in the city. It will be a game changer, and every 3 or 4 year old child will have an opportunity to attend a school readiness. It doesn't matter where they are, they will be served in a high quality way for a bright future, and we are having conversations across the city to really partner for our kids.
- It was noted that it is in the plan to update the Board on the 3K work.
- What is changing with the strategic plan? How will the strategies be different with early childhood? Response: There are various action plans, and early childhood lives throughout the plan. There are 4 pillars, and it starts with early childhood family, and is the first entry for SPPS, and early childhood screening, and early childhood special education, and then PreK. Something that is being looked at is an early childhood hub center to maximize opportunities for family education, PreK for 3 and 4 year olds, early childhood screening, mental health supports, community partnerships would be in this hub. Behind the scenes, the alignment between family engagements, early childhood family education, special education and supporting screenings.
- A board member noted the concern about coherence instead of fidelity. Is it the right intervention for the student and collective? Do they together come up with the program to net us the results? As a board member, we have a place to look at the accountability. It's interesting to hear about the curricular modes have changed and early childhood reading instruction. It's important to see the tie-in to long-term objectives, and assess how the district and the plan are doing. To see the 6 long-term outcomes, and talking about kindergarten readiness and increase achievement, as long as we can see how the work of PreK and K is changing those outcomes is important, and less concerned about the special interventions, and as long as using the right tools to get to the destination. We want to hear how what



we're doing ties up to those long term goals. We will be looking at the bottom line and looking at the direction. Do we need to look at what to start, stop, sustain, what are we changing to move in the direction, and what do you need from us for support, messaging, etc. There are concerns that we look at the weeds. We need to see the connection. Response: through the planning, there is new nomenclature. We do need to come up with a system to easily code and track with the initiative and outcome, and a way to code that for staff and the community as well. Dr. Gray Akyea has developed an accountability system which will be helpful, so that we become an organization that uses this plan and the way we intend.

#### D. Permits Committee: Community Use of Buildings and Grounds

##### **Intro/Background**

- The board encourages community use of school facilities and has policy (902.00) regarding aspects of access of use of facilities.
- The policy addresses legal use of facilities, supervision of activities, schedule of rates, process for fee waiving and use of buildings during emergencies. Additionally, the District and the City of Saint Paul are parties in an agreement with implications for facilities/grounds access and maintenance.
- SPPS administration is responsible for implementing this policy through procedures.

##### **Data/Statistics**

- FY18 total number of permitted events: 151,844
  - Represents 515,061 hours of use
  - Approximately 75% of non-SPPS use are non-profits or partners
  - Data on SPPS versus External Permitted Hours of Use was also shown, with the majority of hours being SPPS
- FY18 revenue: \$330,507

##### **External Permitted Use by Site**

- A map showing the most permitted use sites was shown, with Highland Park Senior High, Harding Senior High, Como Park Senior High, Washington Tech Secondary, Humboldt Senior High, Battle Creek Middle, and Murray Middle having the largest numbers.

##### **Permits Committee**

- Review policy and procedure of permit operations
- Review fee waiver and reduction applications
- Provide multiple perspectives on issues impacting community usage of building and grounds
- Committee composition:
  - Community Ed: Kristin Keller
  - Office of Family Engagement and Community Partnerships: Heather Kilgore & Aquanetta Anderson
  - Facilities: Jenna Hernandez, Tom Parent, Bruce Gill, and Jacky Olson
  - Security and Emergency Management: Alex Corey

##### **Programmatic and Business Changes Since Last Procedure Update**

- Programmatic updates
  - Costs for staffing and equipment
  - Special events
  - Partnerships
  - Category refinement
  - Fee reduction/waiver
- Business process updates
  - Safety
  - Insurance/liability

##### **Rate Structure Analysis**

- Comparison with other local district space fees
- Calculated average of personnel costs
- Equipment usage fees
- 21<sup>st</sup> Century School Facility Cost Calculator
  - Operating costs
  - Administrative costs
  - Long term debt and capital costs
- SPPS' annual per square foot cost: \$17.21

### **Proposed Rate Structures Changes**

- Current category IV eliminated
- Current category V becomes new category IV (negotiated pricing)
- Fees adjusted to reflect more accurate true costs and better align with market conditions

### **Potential Category Reclassification / Space Fee Reduction Criteria**

- Space fee reduction and category reclassification criteria and process development
  - Formal appeal process refined to eliminate ambiguity, promote consistency, and ensure fair and equitable discounts are applied
- Factors considered for reduction of space fees (for Category II organizations):
  - Percentage of participants / families who attend SPPS or who live in Saint Paul
  - Availability of scholarships if a fee is charged for the activity or event
  - Nominal participation fee charged
  - Uniqueness of offering that supports District's outreach and equity work to underserved communities
- Category Reclassification
  - Organizations appeal their categorization to Permits Committee and provide documentation that supports a potential reclassification

### **Next Steps**

- Discussion and feedback
- SPPS Achieves Initiative 9a Work
  - Work with Board Policy Workgroup to:
  - Consider revisions to Board Policy 902.00, including the rate structure
  - Update SPPS Procedure 902.00.01 - Community Use Of Buildings and Grounds
- Adoption on consent agenda at future BOE meeting:
  - Updated rate structure
  - Updated Procedure 902.00.01

### **QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:**

- The revenue of \$330,000 that was paid in fees for FY18, that's not necessarily profit for the school district? Response: Correct, that is what we brought in overall. The fee may just cover what it costs to open the building. It is not necessarily profit.
- There are times that a facility is used, and other times where the facility is really used, and may require more clean-up if there is food, and extra custodial work. Is that part of the negotiated? Response: It was also noted that adult leagues are Category III is for-profit (non-501c3) or personal use. Bruce represents the engineers perspective, and will consult and add overtime to the permit. For the adult basketball, they will likely have minimal custodial needs and will likely only pay the permit fee. If they have a tournament or on the weekend, it would generate custodial overtime. Reclassification or reductions are only on the space fees. The custodial expenses are true expenses and the fees need to cover that overtime or those costs.
- PTOs and PTAs are considered part of category I, even if it is a fundraiser? Response: Functionally, the permit request doesn't go to Facilities, but the clerk pulls the permit for the event. It's a school event and not part of this work.

- Is 360 Colborne included, since it wasn't in the site use map? Response: It was not included in the usage map, because most of the use in that building is for internal SPPS use, and it's very rarely used for external use.
- Director Vanderwert and Director Schumacher met with the City Council members on shared facilities, and a schedule, and with the changes to our school needs with the start times change this Fall, and the prioritization of facilities for programs is less available for community members, how do we think about that? Response: This process has been helpful to manage that external relationship. Most folks on committee were a part of the process with the city to talk about changing start times and impact on our own athletics and adult league, and this was a mechanism by which we could go site by site, day by day for Fall 2019 and ensure we had what we needed. The partnership is enormous, and the city made important adjustments to their schedule. We have a give and take, and they are pushing their football to weekends for example. Superintendent Gothard has been a part of conversations for the next step in that partnership, and permits are a part, but there is an universal operation that we are looking to build with partners, and having the ability to use each other's portfolio of buildings will be helpful and to build relationships, agreements, and systems to be more formal and helpful.
- If someone submits a permit for an event on the weekend, who can they expect to open to building and what is our protocol? Response: it would generate overtime, it would go to Jenna who works with Bruce and the building engineers and supervisors. Depending on the nature of the event, it could require more custodians, and her office would go through the charges. Custodians and head engineers have access to the permit system, so they are constantly seeing what will be happening in their building to plan ahead and is the main communication tool used.
- When it comes to staffing, does it require the building leader to be there? Or only required for the head engineer? Response: The head engineer will be there, and depending on the time of the year, there may be a certain license that an engineer may need. If it's an external partner, a head engineer needs to be there. We want our engineers to be there for any issues that come up. The process described, the building administrator is copied on the permits. The lead clerk at the building, they have access to the system, and can see what is going on in their building. If it's above a certain threshold of people, then Jenna sends it to the SEM office for further consideration and decisions. If there will be an exchange of money, then there needs to have a police officer. There is a whole assessment for those bigger, and more complex events.
- From a vendor perspective, how long is the process? Response: We ask for 10 days from permit submission for it to be processed, including for a series. All those dates would be on one permit. If people need a space, they can be processed quicker. In dealing with custodial and security to make sure we have staffing, those personnel need to be notified, which is why we ask for the 10 days. Superintendent Gothard also noted that the role of principals and especially of a large high school, we want them to have access and know the permits for their school, so that they are not double booked and for the community to know what is available. Communication is an important piece to make sure we are opening buildings to our community, and is an important part of our mission as well.
- A board member noted that he was confused about the need for category IV, and under what circumstances an event would fall outside the other three categories? Response: One example was a movie that requested to film in one of our schools, and to determine the opportunity to ensure the needs of the district are adequately fulfilled, and to understand the total need, with a fair cost for the production company to use the building.
  - It was noted if it needs a category, and instead had a disclaimer for understanding the opportunity for the district to negotiate rates under circumstances because of permit or amount of request, and something to describe the circumstances. The suggestion is to scrap category IV and make it cleaner for understanding. If the majority of requests fall into categories I, II, or III, we could use a disclaimer for criteria, since category IV is currently all listed as negotiable.
- In the meeting with city council members, we talked about the city having access to our system. Can they look at the buildings to see what space is available and can we see their availability? Response: That is our aspirational goal at the moment, and Jenna is available to look at the system, in order to share those resources with our community. Long-term, that is something that will be valuable for our stakeholders. We have partnered with the city, and when we get calls to host certain events, the

taxpayers are looking for a place, whether it's an SPPS space or city space. Having that be a more streamlined interface is a long-term goal and will be valuable.

- If the city asks to use a building, what category are they? Response: Part of the reason we are advocating for a more universal umbrella of operations, is that it is different based on site. There are individual site use agreements where we use equal amounts of each other's stuff. There is not money that is exchanged, but conversations about examples of how we can balance out the work. There can be more rigor and more of a better structure for that.
- Is there data of how often SPPS has been asked to host city events, or how often SPPS uses city sites such as the recreational centers or libraries? Response: Internally, we can produce that information, and it is all tracked. The city doesn't have the same ability to produce that information because it is site based. It was a fairly significant effort to understand that true use in the school start times conversation to capture the totality of the use.
- SPPS operates more buildings than the city. It's important to have synchronization between the systems, and we are separate fiscally. There are concerns to the extent to which we have requests to use our buildings and are not compensated by the city that we need to absorb into the budget. This is a request for that information for over the past several school years of city usage of buildings, and vice versa. It's important to monitor what is happening in our buildings.
- Is it a permit or agreement with the church at RiverEast for their use of the gym? Response: It is both an agreement and a permit. It is an example of smart urban planning, and sharing resources. The MOU approved lays out the ground rules for the parking, and we will clear the spots for snow, so many hours a week of gym usage, and the permit system tracks that and communicates it, and alerts our distribution staff. Here's what they can use for free each week, and how we track it.
- Is that overtime for staff to open buildings? Response: The majority of permits are held during work hours. If it is a permit that falls outside working hours, they are billed for those overtime costs and falls to the permit owner.
- On the logistics of supporting large events, it is full team effort to understand the events, and a team based approach to be sure we are adequately protecting our buildings and grounds.
- Have we studies how accessible we are to the community? If three teams are requesting to use one facility for the season, how are they prioritized? Response: This is the biggest question in our work to ensure there is equity and fairness with a procedure that is robust and speaks to difference scenarios – that's the impetus for this work. In terms of prioritization, SPPS is first, then the city is second, and then the tiered structure is on a first come, first served process. It was noted that Jenna does a great job of looking for alternatives for groups, if their first choice isn't available and the majority of the time, we can find them a space that will for their needs.
- It would be interesting to collect data and questions to understand the community's perception of how accessible our buildings are to the community and how it contributes to the relationship with community members of how they view our schools as a hub, or where they send their children. It would be interesting if community members think of our schools as a first option for their event, and understanding our access or barriers that community members see, and to learn about our processes for a different angle, and to build better relationships with community members and the city.

#### E. Policy Update

##### **Drug and Alcohol Testing - Policy 416.00 and Policy 417.00**

- New policy that will provide authority so that SPPS may require all employees to submit to drug and alcohol testing
- Reason for new policy:
  - Liability and safety issue
  - No current mechanism (for any employees other than drivers) to rule out or confirm someone is indeed under the influence
- Two policies:
  - 416.00 Drug and Alcohol Testing for All Employees
  - 417.00 Federally Mandated Drug Alcohol Testing for School Bus Drivers

##### **Federally Mandated Drug Alcohol Testing for School Bus Drivers - Policy 417.00**

- SPPS already participates in these practices because it is the law:
  - Pre-Employment Testing
  - Post-Accident Testing
  - Random Testing
  - Reasonable Suspicion Testing
  - Return-To-Duty Testing
  - Follow-Up Testing
- Employees that supervise drivers receive 2 hours of training on performance indicators of probable misuse of alcohol and drugs so they are equipped to make determinations of reasonable suspicion

**Drug and Alcohol Testing for All Employees - Policy 416.00**

- We are removing from the policy:
  - Random Testing
    - Reason: Cost and functionality
  - Job Applicant Testing
    - Reason: Cost; Not consistent with purpose; many organizations moving away from this
  - During Routine Physical Examination Testing
    - Reason: SPPS does not conduct routine physical exams
- We are keeping in the policy:
  - Reasonable Suspicion Testing
    - Makes it easier for District to prove whether or not someone should be disciplined
    - Helps employees who truly have a problem get help
    - If an employee has one positive test, the District must give them an opportunity to participate in treatment before moving to termination
  - Treatment Program Testing
    - Testing may be required as part of an employee’s participation in any chemical dependency treatment under an employee benefit plan, or any chemical dependency treatment to which an employee has been referred by the District.
    - Updated language so easier to understand, removed option to continue testing for 2 years after treatment, and consistent with other local districts

**QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:**

- For the language on the policy from the Feds, that is exact language? Response: Yes.
- For the “reasonable suspicion” – is that pretty vague? How do we figure out reasonable suspicion? Response: It’s reasonable suspicion as in many cases aspects; what one sees, smells, notices. All that builds into reasonable suspicion. It’s legal in terms of backing it up. Reasonable suspicion is standard in search and seizure cases.
- With those changes, have any been vetted with bargaining units or input? Response: We have had groups prior to the previous meetings when brought forward and made mention we would be looking at this. There was not a big pushback. This is common in other public jurisdictions where these groups also work. It’s not an unknown or unseen thing. We have not sent this draft out yet, and maybe sending out something different. If we have something we are close, we can send it out and let folks know and ask them if there are any questions or requests for comments.
  - Would that be part of the reading process? Response: If this draft is something we’re ready to bring forward, we can get it out to those groups before the first reading, depending on how the Board feels about moving forward.
  - The recommendation from the Policy Work Group is to move it forward to the first reading. We were thinking the first reading could be at the February Board of Education meeting. But no one has seen it yet? Response: Correct, but we have not been to the point where we feel we have a final-esque version to show people, and we now have a version to bring forward and email it out to representatives and unions is not a difficult effort and to get responses and meet with them, we can do that. If we are hearing resistant and pushback, we can bring it back if we are hearing concerns and be flexible. In terms of timing, there will be three readings, and we can continue to gain feedback, and if there are changes, we can postpone those further readings along the

way. There is also awareness, and to keep communication if there are issues. We felt like we captured the concerns in those last conversations.

- It was noted that there have been instances in the past where we received concerns brought to supervisors and managers, and we have not had a mechanism for a process. This will give the means and process to be followed to be fair in how we administer and address situations with employees.
- With the focus on “reasonable suspicion”, and thinking about our duty as a district and governing body of the district is to have a procedure in place that deals with this question of reasonable suspicion so that we are protecting students in any situation.
- It was noted that this policy will help to make sure students are not harmed, and to help employees who truly have a problem.
- A board member noted that in this process, we need to ensure we not only publicize this in a formal three-reading process, that we also make an effort to reach out and to include those people about making decisions in reasonable suspicion, to someone who is a reasonable person, and judgment on the spot about a particular employee, that that person has proper training and an idea of what that means. There will be delicate situations where the principal may be informed, and they need to protect our kids, and give the employee due process.
- We want to ensure it is noted that in this policy, we are thinking about our kids and to show a certain paternalistic posture as a district toward students and employees. We want to ensure staff understand this is coming, and we are protecting our kids, and the kids who may be impacted.
- In conclusion, the Board recommended this policy move to the three-reading process, and this draft will be released to the unions in the meantime.

#### **Legislative Change to Uniform Municipal Contracting Law**

- Minn. Stat. § 471.345 establishes contracting requirements and dollar value thresholds that require certain procurement requirements
- Recently, the dollar value threshold increased from \$100K to \$175K
- Because SPPS Policy 713.00 references and incorporates Minn. Stat. § 471.345, it will also incorporate the increased threshold
- If Board takes no action, Policy 713.00 will automatically allow the District to not use advertised public bidding for projects under \$175K

#### **Questions for Board Following the Legislative Change**

- Procurement: Does the Board want to follow the change in the law and increase the dollar value threshold that requires advertised public bidding?
  - Option #1. Do nothing. If the Board wants to allow the increased limit of \$175K to take effect, then no policy changes are required.
  - Option #2. Amend Policy 713.00. If the Board wants to require that District policy requires advertised public bidding at a lower dollar value threshold (e.g. \$100K), then the Board can amend Policy 713.00 to be more restrictive than the statute.
- **Oversight.** At what dollar value does the Board want to review contracts?
  - Presently, the Board reviews and approves any contract for services or the purchase of goods over \$100K. The Board may maintain that review level or increase the amount that requires Board review and approval to \$175K.

#### **QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:**

- It would be helpful to have the number of contracts talking about, and a sense of review versus not review. What is the break-out? What kinds of contracts fall within the range? Response: It was about 3% of total contracts that fall between \$100,000-\$175,000. In 2018, we had a total of 1,976 contract POs, and 62 of them were between \$100,000-\$175,000, so roughly 3% fell in that range. For under \$100,000, it's about 85%-90%. The vast majority already fall under the threshold, and would be a small number that fall above.
- What's the level of scrutiny that the board wants to look at? Curious to know what board members think about that.

- In discussion with the state and their limit to the threshold, do we know anything about that? Response: Some thought that as you migrate to a larger threshold, it gives the advantage to contract with smaller, women-owned and minority owned contractors, which are the smaller size contracts, and not necessarily go out for bid that may be a cumbersome project for them. With the ability go out without an advertised process and select potential bidders on an unadvertised basis, you can target those business to a certain degree. The \$100,000 contract does not buy as much today due to inflation. This was initially adopted in 1973, which covered a lot of contracts at that time.
- Another thought behind it was the more steps, the more money and time it costs, and this would help to make it efficient, and we have professional staff to make good judgments. Giving the flexibility and taking those extra steps could help us to save money and make it simpler.
- The second point on board oversight of contracts and procurement – the nature of the facilities overruns we have had, a board member noted he is uncomfortable with giving away the board oversight for those contracts that fall below \$175,000. (He was in favor of moving to the \$175,000 competitive bid threshold though state statute.) If we were hitting the marks with projects each year, it's helpful to see those. He would just as soon not change that and to see those still approved by the Board.
- The policy is written with reference to the statute, and the statute governs the threshold for the bidding and review by the Board. Unless we do something, everything goes up. Do we want to break it into two? Do we have a sense of what other municipalities are doing? Response: We can get that information. Consistency would be helpful.
- Another board member echoed this and look at the neighboring school district to compare, and get a better understanding of the decision according to the changing of the matrix of approval, and look in what other school board approve in terms of contracts and to compare it to other school districts. Response: That information can be provided. In terms of timing, the statute has changed. Our internal process has continued.
- The Board recommended to bring back that other information in order to gain a better sense and what is going on in other entities. The legislative history of why will also be beneficial, and it would be helpful to substantiate with data on if this was a change to bring onboard more women-owned and minority owned business, and the question of what other entities do in terms of this process, and the why of the legislature's intent.
- The contract matrix was also noted that the Board needs to vote on, and it highlights who is authorized to enter into a contract with the district. If the Board moves forward with it, it supports purchasing and legal when we have issues when someone is entering into a contract that was not authorized.
- Is there a timeframe? Response: Our vote would be to keep it at \$100,000, which would be a change in policy, because it currently follows state statute. The vote would be to be more restrictive.
- The matrix was highlighted that exists internally, and be codified through a vote and be placed on the district website to show the authority of those who are able and authorized to enter into a contract on behalf of SPPS. The ask would be the Board votes on the contract signature authority matrix and for it to be posted online as a public document.
- What are "attractive" and "portable" in reference to on the matrix? Response: We will wait to look more at the matrix, and Purchasing can follow-up with clarification.

#### **516.00 Medications/Medical Procedures**

- Revision of the policy
  - Restructure of sentences
  - Re-wording
    - "Building administrator" to replace "principal" (paragraph 2)
    - "Needed at school" to replace "prescribed" (paragraphs 4a, 4b)
- Additions to the policy:
  - Purpose statement
  - Paragraph 5 - overnight field trips / in original, labeled container
  - Paragraph 10 - emergency medication
- Work Group recommendation: advance to COB

#### **QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:**

- The building administrator can determine the designee who gives the medications. We wanted that language broader than principal. “Needed at school” was changed to medically prescribed because there are over-the-counter medicines and treatments, that we will need to be medically prescribed and necessary. We also want to expedite the approval of students to go on field trips, which was another change to the policy, and eliminates the need for a physician or health care provider to approve the permission to give the medication at overnight field trips. Emergency medication is either provided by the students or we have stock Epi-Pens provided by the pharmaceutical companies, and could cover those medications. We don’t purchase it, but provide a protocol, and this is a major addition to the policy.
- Albuterol is a broad scope of inhalers. Response: We have been working with Children’s Hospital on asthma and Kohl’s, and are stuck right now with the board of pharmacy around getting stock Albuterol. We would never use a medication we don’t have medical orders to use, but would have it. Pharmacists are looking into funding for providing the inhalers, but the pharmacists are saying we are dispensing medication. We do not want to evolve to a crash cart or large amount of emergency medication, but Albuterol and Epi-Pens may make sense over time.
- Are we experiencing situations where the nurse isn’t there, and therefore students are not receiving the medications? What brought us to this point? Response: It is ten years old, and we wanted to add the emergency medication information. A principal identifies the designee and we train two or three deep, and we need to assure that students will receive their medications, and train multiple people.
- It was also noted that there is set protocol, and not convenience of who is surrounding the students. It’s the partnership between the nurse and the administrator, because the nurse is not going to delegate a person who does not want to, and it’s important that the delegate also accept the responsibility and communicate with administration.
- Is emergency medication included in those medicines that must be administered during the school day? Response: Yes, if we have an order from their health care provider. It would be the same person. Extended Day Learning also is covered. There is a nurse also assigned to EDL to train that staff. Discovery Club falls under Community Education, and the parent is delegating the staff to administer the medicine, and the parent has a role. It will be Discovery Club staff.
- In our contract negotiations with administrators, they have expressed concern about being put in uncomfortable situations about administering medication. It would not be done without designee’s okay. How does this affect further contract negotiations? Can we add something about upon consent of the designee in the language, and the scenario referenced? Response: There is someone in a building, and in that school there will be a nurse, health aid, LPN, who is the primary individual. There are back-ups within the building so that if the individual isn’t in that day, the medications are still addressed. That comes through with the principal or AP asking folks if they would like to be a designee and learn from the school nurse. If they say yes, they get the training for those students and how the medications are administered.
  - If they have not been comfortable? Response: it varies across the board, and there have been discussions on it. Can we have someone who is a primary individual from the Office of Health and Wellness, and had Mary Yackley at the negotiations table to address those issues. It is working better. We have added 13 health assistants, and there are less than 6 elementary schools that don’t have one full time. We have staff trained for medications for those students. We are reluctant to add language about consent of staff because the policy is to ensure the student’s chronic health concerns are addressed and managed by someone trained to give medication. We need to be sure someone else is trained and that person isn’t available. Clerks were the bulk of the designees, and most of the concerns have been addressed. The designee language has always been there. Another concern is that consent could be varied. If a person isn’t comfortable, we don’t force that to happen.
- Would it be beneficial to say in our policy that upon a principal designating a staff member to administer a medication, they must have that verbal conversation? Response: That is part of the medication process at the protocol level in training to designees. When training happens, it is documents, and there are re-trainings so people are aware of new students and new medications.



The consent and delegation is part of the protocol and part of the procedure of being a medication designee.

- There are concerns about the staff who are not comfortable with designated, however may be the best person to do it. We want to ensure the staff administering the medication is confident and 100% in the knowledge of the process, and doing it in a way for the safety of the student and confident in giving the medication. Where do we also take care of our staff? Response: The nurse with the license is getting the consent from that individual. The administrator designates the person. If that person doesn't show competence, or pass their training, or says they are uncomfortable, it is not that all cares go to that person. There are 600 special education paras that function as medication administrators for their students, or staff who work closely and say they will give a student their medication based on their time and knowledge with the students. It's the nurse working with a large group of designees will be. It is 1-2 people per student on medication.
- In our smaller buildings with not a lot of additional staff, the concern is the clerk is also doing medical administration, and is among their duties with a host of other things, and the responsibility is being added to those staff. There will be days where a nurse isn't available. The second is the adequacy of the training, and the range of medical needs. Response: There was a recommendation to building administration to be trained in first aid and CPR training, to help them feel more comfortable in general. They are often the first person the student sees. The training happens at a granular level between administration and the nurse, and is personalized based on the student. There is standards training provided to all as well. In cases where there has maybe been a nurse two days a week, and a student needs an insulin pump or other medical needs, a health assistant will be added. The clerk and principal will be a back-up. Once the parent knows there is a health assistant that can help their student, other parents will look for schools where the staff is trained in the condition their students has. We are close to having each school with a health assistant – the dual campuses have one together. There are under 6 schools that don't have full-time coverage.
- In conclusion, the Board approved this recommendation to move this policy to the first reading.

### **III. ADJOURNMENT**

It was motioned to adjourn the meeting at 8:51 p.m. The motion passed by acclaim.

Respectfully submitted,  
Sarah Dahlke  
Assistant Clerk