MEETING MINUTES
COMMITTEE OF THE BOARD MEETING
March 6, 2018

PRESENT:	Board of Education:	S. Marchese, Z. Ellis, J. Schumacher, J. Brodrick, M. Vanderwert, M. Xiong, J. Foster
	SEAB:	M. Raymond, M. Omar
	Staff:	Superintendent Gothard, C. Baker, J. Jonassen, C. Mahaney, A. Schilling, K. McCauley, H. Kilgore, M. Hoerth, A. Collins, M. Gilbert, J. Turner, E. Agbamu, K. Wilcox-Harris, L. Sayles-Adams, J. Engen, M. Schrul, M. Dols Klingel, G. Ghere, S. Koppen, J. Bobolink, I. Davis, L. Cathey, J. Allen, D. Ginther, T. Battle, H. Ott, S. Dahlke
	Other:	J. Kopp, J. Verges

I. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 4:35 p.m.

II. AGENDA

A. Superintendent's Update

Dr. Gothard began the meeting with a couple updates, as well as the introduction of two presentations. The first will be information on graduation rate results, with the second being a recap of the strategic plan development updates from the meeting of the previous week. Due to the recent snow and weather, he noted that the City identified routes near hills and schools, and they assured us they would allow for extra plows in those areas. Although it may have been slow driving, we were able to transport our students to where they needed to be. Dr. Gothard also mentioned that he toured a variety of schools in San Francisco and Oakland last week with the Bush Foundation. It was a great experience, and one of the main findings stressed personalized learning for our students – who are they, what do they need, and where are they going. We need to think about the relationships with our students and the role of personalized learning within that relationship in helping our students succeed.

2017 Graduation Results
Kate Wilcox-Harris, Chief Academic Officer, Stacey Gray-Akyea, Director of REA, and Theresa Battle, Assistant Superintendent, presented the results of the 2017 graduation rates.

What's Working

- High School Focus on Freshman (transition to high school)
- Check and Connect (target strategy for American Indian students and Special Education students)
- AVID and AVID strategies in Special Education courses
- Counselor professional learning communities
- College and Career Readiness
- Graduation to Greatness (senior persistence)

4 Year: Guide for Interpretation

- Graduation Change in Calculation

- This year's graduation results reflect MDE's revisions to the graduation calculation, as part of its implementation of the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA). To maintain comparability across years, MDE has applied the changes retroactively to previous years going back to the class of 2012.

- Change in Reporting Student Racial Groups
  - Beginning in SY 2017-18, MDE and SPPS will no longer report results using FIVE student racial groups. We will report using the SEVEN federal racial categories. Under ESSA, EL, FRL, and SPED categories include a student if they are a member of those groups at any time in their HS tenure (previously the categories were defined by students' status in 9th grade.)This may result in a small change in graduation rates for these categories.

SPPS 2017 4-Year Graduation

- SPPS class of 2017 4-year graduation rate is 76.9%; approximately 3 out of 4 students graduated in 4 years.

SPPS to State

- SPPS to State Comparisons were presented. SPPS students in the Class of 2017 graduated in four years at a higher rate than their peers, statewide, in the following groups of students. Note: this graph does not show all groups – only those who graduated at a higher rate that their statewide peers.
  - American Indian
  - Hispanic
  - Black
  - English Learners
  - Free/Reduced Price Lunch
  - Homeless
- Surpassing State Averages: All Students
  - The high schools with students graduating in four years that are higher than the state with all students was also presented. With the state average at 82.7%, Central, Highland Park, Johnson, Open World, and Washington had higher rates than the state.
  - Five schools surpassed the state average for students experiences homelessness
  - Six schools surpassed the state average for Hispanic students
  - Seven schools surpassed the state average for Black students and ELL students
  - Eight schools surpassed the state average for low income/free-and-reduced-lunch eligible students
- 5-Year, 6-Year, 7-Year: Guide for Interpretation
  - The 5-year and 6-year graduation rates show the number of students who took additional time to earn sufficient credits or to meet other graduation requirements to receive a high school diploma from their district. These two extended-year graduation rates are calculated in the same way as the 4-year rate, but instead determine the percent of students graduating in five years and six years. Cohorts are defined by the expected graduating class, and rates accrue cumulatively.
  - The rates of graduation for 5-year, 6-year, and 7-year for the Class of 2012, Class of 2013, and Class of 2014 were also shown.

<u>QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:</u>

- While the homeless student graduation rate is surpassing the state average, it is still low. What are we doing to address that? Answer: We do need to do more. We do have staff who work specifically with that group, and it would be beneficial to bring them closer to the conversation earlier. Students, teachers, and counselors should all be part of that conversation. We need to ensure students are tracked and monitored. One of the aspects of Check and Connect is the targeted groups, where it is successful and students who are experiencing homelessness could also benefit.

    - When are we tracking those students? Answer: For the current data results it is through ninth and twelfth grade, they are being tracked. If at anytime they experience homelessness from EC to 12th grade, they are identified to receive supports. It is crucial to identify those students and ensure they have the necessary supports.
- Another board member notes that the data is exciting to see and analyze. She is also curious about one of the programs contributing to the graduation rate was college readiness. It will also be interesting to compare data of graduates who are going to college. It is a benchmark to graduate from high schools, but success is also about changing outcomes and lives. It will be interesting to look at the data, and to see how we are doing with our college readiness programs and how it contributes to our rate of students going to college. Answer: Greenway Strategy Group presented three slides on college rates, including persistence and more female students going to college. Compared to data nationally, we have evidence that our kids are making transition to college better than national average, but also one year later are still in college, as well as college graduation rates. We are excited to break that data down to determine who is in that data, and who may be missing.
- A board member requested an overview on Focus on Freshmen. Answer: We know that during adolescence presents a time of unique aspects and we need to provide supports to those. Freshmen are 13 and 14 years old, and the changes of adolescence coupled with the transition from middle to high school can have high stakes; students are learning in a new setting and staff needs to ensure their learning environment is one that will help to graduate. It is a program where each school has strategies to ensure students are on track in high school, while also understanding adolescent needs. Counselors and staff help to support freshmen in the transition of activities, and other aspects of high school and what the new environment will look like. It is important to help students stay on track when they enter high school instead of reaching out when they have become off track.
- Another board member noted that some high schools are not shown and wondered why they were not included in these slides. Answer: For all student groups, they had percentages less than 82.7. The exact numbers can be sent to the Board, as well as the ALC program data.
- As we're celebrating the schools with higher than state data, it is also important to talk about the other schools and be looking at what they're doing and what we're doing to support them to ensure they also climb to these same numbers. It's disappointing that we are not looking at those other schools in this presentation.
    - In 2016 we were celebrating Creative Arts, but this year, they had a drop. We need to know the scoring behind the numbers. We meet with principals to tell us about their schools. Another example is Como Park – we need to speak with the principals and ask questions to find out what happened and those stories.
    - Most students at Bridge View and Journeys are on the 7-year plan to graduate. At the 7-year rate, the graduation was just under 65%. We are on a good path to keep those students engaged to graduate.
- For students who graduate and do not go onto a two- or four-year college, they drop off the map in terms of how we understand their success. Is there a way to track them? Or to understand the percentage of kids who graduate and don't go to a two- or four-year college? Answer: There are two major way to analyzing students after graduation. One is post-secondary data, and the other is SLEDS (database comparable to MDE.) In the post-secondary database, we have seen students take a year off and then enroll at a college. If they are a graduate of SPPS, they will show up in that database. For students who don't enroll in post-secondary, it is difficult to track them. There are other ways to design follow-ups for students and ask for forwarding address to connect with them after graduation.
    - If you could find students in an institution, that would give percentage of how many aren't from a graduating class, which would be interesting. Other students go onto jobs and careers and are successful. Answer: We also have a number of students who enter the military. OWL had the highest number of students who enter the military, and they do not have a JROTC. It is about finding the stories behind the numbers to tell us more.
- It was mentioned that the transition from middle school to high school can be difficult, and one where we lose students. Do we lose them because they don't go onto high school, or do they land and then leave, or they never land? Answer: The data suggests they land and then leave; patterns

also suggest they land, move to different schools and then leave. Sometimes they land, leave the district, and then return to the district. It is different from the transition from fifth to six grade as the data shows that we lose those students out of the district. There are programs we could offer in approaching this as well. Never Too Late to Graduate was a program in which we find students and bring them back (potentially 600 students), as well as Gateway to College. Those students who may not have had enough credits to graduate were able to recoup their credits so they are able to graduate in August. Our system is changing to address the needs of our students.

- A board member also questioned who was considered English Language Learner. They are students who between grades 9 and 12 were identified as speaking a language other than English at home. Some students received EL learning support in school, while others have not, but they are still identified.
    - She then noted that Asian American students were not included in the slide on demographics, and that ELL students are not reflective of Asian American students. We need to be inclusive of all students in the District. Staff then noted that this information was only to show the groups who surpassed the state average, and did not show all groups. The graduation rate for Asian American students was 80.6%, which did not surpass the state average. White students graduated at an 84.3% rate, which also did not surpass the state average. That detailed information can be sent to the Board.
- A member of SEAB wondered about those students who take a gap year off and then go to college. Answer: SLEDS does not track those students, which is the Minnesota database. We do receive post secondary information however and can infer of reasoning behind that data.
- In going back to college and career-readiness, we have direct pathways from some elementary schools. How are we talking about the hopes, dreams and aspirations of our students and families? Is there a point in the 9th grade where we talk with students about their college and career path? Are there check-ins? Answer: As part of the counseling curriculum, college and career milestone objectives are included in that. We try to build that relationship earlier and more often. We are also working with SEAB to increase diversity in advanced coursework. Often times, students are also initiating those conversations, and with growth and development to apply for scholarships and college match programs. The sentiment to inspire a college-ready culture is within every staff member, and there is a strategic focus within the district and school culture to have models that students can aspire to be.
- Finally, a board member noted the proficiency and MCA scores and ACT numbers and their relation to college success for students. We need to ensure our diplomas have value behind them. Data on creating outcomes, proficiency measurements, and remediation would be helpful to know so we are aware of how our graduating students are prepared. Answer: Advanced coursework data shows that 58% of students are participating in an advanced course. We strive for it to be around 68%. We are a data-rich district and can encourage questions and conversations on this topic. We want students to be prepared for college because if they need to take a development course in college, it is the same tuition and may not count toward their total credits needed. There is a whole suite of indicators to preparing for college and career. More information will also be shared at the March Board of Education Meeting.

<u>Update on Strategic Plan Development</u>

A brief recap on the development of the strategic plan was presented. To follow-up on the previous special meeting of the Board of Education on this topic, the mission, long-terms outcomes, strategic focus areas, and strategic initiatives were shown. The strategy development process overview was also discussed, with the current phase being Phase 2: Strategy Development with an emphasis on the community input sessions.

Community Input Sessions

- The purpose of these sessions is for the community to give feedback on the draft strategic framework
- Participants will discuss in small groups led by a trained district facilitator
- Sessions will occur now through April 13th
- Groups can request an input session

- Districtwide community input session scheduled for March 21st

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:

- It was noted that through these feedback sessions, it will be a chance for us to go out and talk to students, families, and the community who may not usually speak up at bigger meetings. It will be an opportunity to determine what is working or not working for specific percentages of students.
- A board member remarked that if we want to reach more people, we need to really think about how these meetings are facilitated, especially since the first meeting will be the most important in terms of feelings throughout the community. If people are skeptical about the information in the first session, they may tell others. Answer: We have trained facilitators in this work. They will approach feedback sessions in a way to make information accessible to all who attend, including the various stakeholders. We are not simply giving them the framework and asking them to respond – we are beginning with a presentation on the findings and how we got here, as well as to walk through each bullet point and explain them. We will ask probing questions that will encourage conversation and discussion.
- There will also be targeted meetings to ensure all groups are speaking to reflect the views of the district.
- Are we doing outreach? Are we using the PAC network and facilitating meetings with individual PACs? Answer: Yes. Similar to the Superintendent Search, we invite all PACs to a meeting, and they then break off, and come back together. Others are interested in hosting their own session and bringing in a facilitator specifically for their group.
- Another board member explained that it is important that we are not only responding to requests, but also moving into other spaces outside the normal times and venues to reach those stakeholders who may not be able to attend. The quality of outreach is important and that we do not rely on people to come to us, but it is also important to go out to them.
- The link to the website to request a session is currently online and live. Our efforts are to get out to the community to help everyone speak their authentic voice. Communication has begun with those groups who have raised their hand, and we are also working with those other groups who did not raise their hands to ensure that we are compiling as much community input as possible.
- It was also noted that there are other aspects of the strategic plan there may be questions on where those topics live in the strategic plan – such as school start times. Those can fall into a strategic initiative, and be part of our ongoing, operational work.
- How will we be using our research, and what we know to plan for best practices in our planning? Answer: In Phase 2, there will be defining initiatives, and the research will begin. Once strategic initiatives are selected, there will be developing action plan, and we will rely on different data sources to be successful.
- Will we be coordinating with partners within the city, and are there plans to engage them? Answer: Yes.

B. Legislative Update

Mary Gilbert, Legislative Liaison, then provided an update on the current legislative session

Session Update

- Special Elections: two new members
- Legislative Funding Bill passed and signed
- House and Senate appointed conference committees for all major spending/tax bills
- Deadlines
  - Policy – March 22 and March 29
  - Finance – April 20
- Hot topics: bonding and tax conformity

February Budget Forecast | +$329M

- Surplus $329 million; budget reserve at $1.6 billion
- All revenue sources, i.e. income, sales, corporate franchise are up

- E-12 spending down $54M - $19M reduction in compensatory aid, and $28M due to reduction in special ed spending compared to forecast
- HHS spending also down; CHIPS adds $255M to forecast
- $129M added to fund legislature and commissions
- Next Biennium shows surplus – however $1.2B more needed if added inflation
- Supplemental budget out March 15th

School Safety – Legislation

- Increase safe schools funding (support)
- Expand long term facilities uses to include safety improvements (support)
- Beef up background checks for gun purchases (support)
- Court petition for deemed threat (support/interventions)
- Threat assessment team/s (prefer district wide team)
- Permit teachers to carry guns; overrides school policy on prohibition of guns (oppose)
- Allow MDH to study gun violence (support)
- Increase school linked mental health grants and support services personnel (support)
- Multiple bills on professional code of ethics, licensing, revocation for certain offenses

E-12 Legislation

- Special Education Task Force – moving in both bodies
- PreK – Mpls/St. Paul own region, maintains commissioner authority for pathway II and funds base
- EL Increase – districts with high concentration EL Extended time for summer juvenile/corrections program
- Grow Your Own/Teachers of Color – teacher residency program
- Referendum renewal without voter approval
- Add civics requirement and move it to 11th and 12th grade
- No start times for secondary before 8:30am
- Require alternatives to suspensions
- Move administration of MCAs to May
- New school report card bill – 100 point system
- Counselors required to provide counseling for armed forces career options

TRA and Saint Paul Teacher Pension

- Omnibus Pension Bill | SF 2620/HF3053
    - Includes funding for both Saint Paul Teacher and TRA Employer Controbution increases
    - Includes $5M direct payment to fund
    - Other reform provisions benefits and earnings assumptions

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION: None

C. SEAB Update and Resolution on Gun Violence

SEAB members noted that they are currently looking at the lack of diversity in AP and IB classes, and determining the racial groups of students, reasoning, as well as where the gap occurs. They will be starting the process of collecting data from teachers and students to pinpoint where students are dropping the class or not entering.
They also have sparked discussion on gun violence issues. They are supporting the march to the capital on March 7th, with the walkout starting at Central. Another protest on March 14th is also planned which will be larger and city-wide. It is the more recommended protest because it is 17 minutes in length. The District has decided to allow this excused absence because it is 17 minutes,

and as long as they return to class – one minute for each of the victims in the recent Florida shooting. There is also a march planned for March 24th in Washington D.C.

The Board then moved into the joint discussion with SEAB on the gun violence resolution. There are a number of drafts and changes currently circulating, and the hope is that it will be approved at the March Board of Education meeting. SEAB members are interested in commenting and speaking on this topic at the BOE meeting. The current draft was a starting point which will lead to comments, revisions, and a more solidified resolution for final approval.

The resolution was prepared with assistance of Mary Gilbert and General Counsel, who cautioned to ensure the facts are accurate.

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:

- It was noted that the third WHEREAS, which states that teachers are not trained law enforcement, and should not be incentivized to make weapons accessible in schools was important, as well as the statement about mental health counselors in schools. SEAB acknowledges that this could help to determine warning signs.
- The timeline for discussion and comments with SEAB was reviewed. There is a sense of urgency to pass this resolution due to the recent events. The Board will continue to work with SEAB in the final drafting of this resolution.
- Has consideration been given to the resolution in terms of what types of weapons should be banned, or is our intent to keep it more general? Answer: If the Board feels that is appropriate, it could be added. However, Mary Gilbert did recommend that it is better not to weigh in on a regulatory role, in that we can't control an assault weapon ban. We have agreed to keep the focus of context on our concerns within schools, environment, and the well-being of our students.

D. FY 2019 General Fund Budget Update

Chief Finance Officer, Marie Schrul, provided an update on the FY 2019 general fund budget.

Update as of 3/6/2018: The Finance Office is currently working on FY19 budget calculations for schools and programs.

FY2018-2019 General Fund Preliminary Big Picture (no change)

	FY18 Adopted (in $M)	FY19 Preliminary (in $M)	Difference (in $M)
Revenue (current law)	$ 521.4	$ 528.0	$ 6.6
Use of Fund Balance	$ 0	$ 0	$ 0
Expenditures	$ 521.4	$ 545.2	$ (23.8)
Projected FY19 Shortfall	**$ 0**	**$ (17.2)**	

FY2018-2019 General Fund Projected Revenue

Projected Revenue Changes:	Amount $M
General Fund Levy Increase (revenue restricted to specific levy items)	$ 5.3

State Aid Increase (mostly due to increase in per pupil funding amount)	$ 2.1
Compensatory Education Decrease (based on 10/1/17 Free & Reduced lunch count)	$ (0.8)
Total FY19 Projected Revenue Increase	**$ 6.6**

FY2018-2019 General Fund Projected Expenditures

Projected Expenditure Changes:	Amount $M
Inflationary impact of "rolling over" the FY 2017-18 Adopted salary & benefits budget	$ 23.4
Inflationary impact of "rolling over" the FY 2017-18 Adopted non-salary budget	$ 0.4
Total FY19 Projected Expenditure Increase*	**$ 23.8**

*Assuming all FY2017-18 budgeted expenditures are rolled forward to FY2018-19.

The FY2018-19 budget timeline was then reviewed. Currently, the tentative timeline shows that Finance will be preparing the FY19 budget allocations and system testing (pending Feb 26 enrollment and planning criteria are received by the Finance Dept.). March 30, 2018 will be the distribution of school allocations, followed by general fund program allocations on April 6th. April 9-20 will be joint FY19 budget, staffing, enrollment meetings. April 23-May 4 will be districtwide school budget presentation timeline for all principals to present budget information at their sites. On April 30, school budgets will be returned, as well as program budgets and HR staffing worksheets. At the June 19, 2018 Board of Education meeting, the FY2018-19 budget will be adopted.

Next will be a deep dive into the distribution and allocations, including changes with class size and enrollment, as well as utilizing Title I funds.

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:

- Will there be any formal venues for those that would like to approach the Board about the budget? Answer: The main engagement opportunities will be Public Comment sessions at Board of Education Meetings, and those members of the BFAC group. Budget information is also posted online, and there are other information sources in the works.
- Another board member noted her appreciation for the extension in the timeline for schools.
- When schools have the information, when are those presentations happening, and what will they look like? Answer: Schools are starting to have those conversations with the budget toolkit, and videos. It will be the big picture from the district level, and will then move down. Meetings at schools would start as early as April 23rd. Principals are aware that they need to plan for this during a window of time. It's understood that not all schools will present this in the same way, and tools are included in the toolkit to present this information. We are setting these up in a way that principals feel comfortable, secure, and supported in the presentation to their building community. It is more an overall picture of the school and is informational.
- Another board member noted that there is a balancing act that the Board and Superintendent need to follow to ensure our principals feel comfortable with these events and to ensure they do not feel caught in between. We need to be sensitive to the school community's concerns as well. These presentations need to answer "what does it mean for me" in terms of family, student, building, and district. Given what we have, this is what our school will look like.
- The CFO also explained that through the budget process with principals, there is an allocation summary page provided to all administrators to see the allocation process to a certain level. She also discussed the role of discretionary funds and staffing.

- Another board member noted that when the budget descends on a site, sometimes it is not good news and it is important to explain the reasoning and how it all works within our community, and the vision for the school. We can talk about what it means for this year, but also the vision for the school and where it is leading, an understanding of a larger strategy, and it's important to wed these conversations with how the budget works. What can parents and students expect as a minimum promise of what each school will offer?
- Another board member reiterated the messaging and how it is framed; not only for staff, but also families, leadership in schools and expectations; what it means for the community.
- It will be helpful to know the criteria and its relationship to the allocations. There will be questions and concerns on that and the formula. It will be helpful information for the community as they view this information and understand the justifications, as well as why, what can be changed versus what can't be changed.
- The board also requested the collection of data, information, and summaries from buildings. What happened, questions, concerns, and where that information will live.
- Finally, another board member brought up a story about a community in Colorado where they wanted to build a new building. They didn't base it on the money though, but who they were as a community, and who they will become in the process of building. In terms of SPPS, we can say we have these resources, determine who we will become with those resources, and what we can do together to shape the school maybe given our limited resources. We can shape conversations to build on who we are as a district, instead of solely based on a dollar amount.

E. First FY 2017-2018 Budget Revision

Chief Schrul then went on to present the first FY 2017-2018 budget revision, including the general fund and assigned fund balance re-appropriation, fully financed funds, revenue changes in all funds, and expenditure changes in all funds.

FY18 Budget Revision General Fund – Assigned Fund Balance Re-Appropriation

Assigned Category	**Amount**	**Description**
Encumbrances	$ 3,226,903	Open Purchase Order balances from FY17 carried over to FY18
Site & Program Carryover/ Fall Adjustments	$ 3,370,628	FY17 carryover balance of non-salary items in school & program budgets, Fall 2017 enrollment adjustments
Total Assigned Fund Balance Re-appropriation	**$ 6,597,531**	

FY18 Budget Revision – Fully Financed Funds (revenue and expenditure changes)

- Revenue on fully financed funds reflects the approval of grants under $500,000 that were not adopted in FY18 as well as revisions to adopted grants

		Description	**Amount**
1.		General Fund Fully Financed Increase	$ 11,126,254
2.		Community Service Fully Financed Increase	$ 1,188,622

FY18 Budget Revision – All Funds Revenue Changes

Fund	Adopted Budget	Revision	Revised Budget
General Fund	$ 521,446,074	$ 0	$ 521,446,074
General Fund Fully Financed	$ 39,944,369	$ 11,126,254	$ 51,070,623
Food Service	$ 29,366,500	$ 0	$ 29,366,500
Community Service	$ 23,563,001	$ 0	$ 23,563,001
Community Service Fully Financed	$ 7,409,063	$ 1,188,622	$ 8,597,685
Building Construction	$ 30,994,856	$ 0	$ 30,994,856
Debt Service	$ 37,860,000	$ 0	$ 37,860,000
Total Revenue	**$ 690,583,863**	**$ 12,314,876**	**$ 702,898,739**

FY18 Budget Revision – All Funds Expenditure Changes

Fund	Adopted Budget	Revision	Revised Budget
General Fund	$ 521,446,074	$ 6,597,531	$ 528,043,605
General Fund Fully Financed	$ 39,944,369	$ 11,126,254	$ 51,070,623
Food Service	$ 29,366,500	$ 0	$ 29,366,500
Community Service	$ 23,878,458	$ 0	$ 23,878,458
Community Service Fully Financed	$ 7,409,063	$ 1,188,622	$ 8,597,685
Building Construction	$ 57,618,661	$ 0	$ 57,618,661
Debt Service	$ 51,592,123	$ 0	$ 51,592,123
Total Revenue	**$ 690,583,863**	**$ 18,912,407**	**$ 750,167,655**

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:

- What are some examples of encumbered expenses carried over? Answer: Examples include purchase order for constructions, a program that is year-round, summer school orders, items that were ordered during the summer; a lot of them are construction and security in the Facilities area. As you have a lot of dollars flowing in and out, such as funding for the LTFM, part of which is funded through the General Fund. Other examples are orders for larger materials or construction materials that may carry over if the project is ongoing, supply backorders, or orders not completely received, year-round custodians, etc.
- It was also noted that this has been one of the lowest years for school and site carryover. Principals will have discretionary funds and will mindfully plan for them. They may request to carryover dollars especially for staff, replenish a computer lab, or another specific project; not to simply spend it to spend it. They are purposeful in spending those dollars for budget and their building, and would

rather carry it over in a planned way. Sometimes they have carryover requests to fund a portion of a TA or EA, but they plan those dollars in detail for staffing or supplies.

RECOMMENDED MOTION: Ms. Xiong moved, seconded by Ms. Foster, to approve the revised budget for fiscal year 2017-2018. The motion passed by acclaim.

The motion was approved with the following roll call vote.

Ms. Ellis	Yes
Ms. Foster	Yes
Mr. Brodrick	Yes
Ms. Xiong	Yes
Ms. Vanderwert	Yes
Mr. Schumacher	Yes
Mr. Marchese	Yes

F. December 2017 Quarterly Budget Report

Chief Schrul also presented the December 31, 2017 Quarterly Financial Report. It is an update to the Board of Education on the current fiscal year 2017-2018 budget and includes a projection of revenue, expenditures, and fund balance as of June 30, 2018. A budget is a living, viable document. Once the budget is accepted in June, the Board is asked 3 times during the following year to look at and approve the changes that occur in the District's revenue and expenditures in each of the seven funds. The final determination, by fund, occurs each fall, following the acceptance of the audit report. The unassigned fund balance in the General Fund is required to maintain a balance of 5% per Board policy. The fund balance in the Food Service fund is controlled by federal USDA regulations. The full report can be found in the Board Book.

The full report was then discussed. There is $32M in unassigned, which is the "rainy day" fund. We are currently at 5.5% unassigned fund balance; last year was at 5.8%. The recommendation is to not touch the fund balance at this point in the budget season, and we will know more if there are additional opportunities.

It was also noted that there are five buckets of funds as described by the government standards board.

RECOMMENDED MOTION: Ms. Foster moved, seconded by Mr. Schumacher, to accept the December 2017 Quarterly Budget Report as presented. The motion passed by acclaim.

III. ADJOURNMENT

It was motioned to adjourn the meeting at 7:43 p.m. The motion passed by acclaim.

VI. WORK SESSION

The Board then conducted a work session on a joint powers agreement with SPPS and Ramsey County Attorney's Office.

Respectfully submitted,

Sarah Dahlke
Assistant Clerk