

**MEETING MINUTES  
COMMITTEE OF THE BOARD MEETING  
September 12, 2017**

PRESENT: Board of Education: J. Schumacher, S. Marchese (arrived at 4:37), Z. Ellis, J. Brodrick, M. Vanderwert, J. Foster (arrived at 4:35), C. Vue (arrived at 4:43 p.m.)

Staff: Superintendent Gothard, A. Collins, B. Kinder, Y. Vang, H. Ott, I. Davis, C. Baker, M. Gilbert, H. Kilgore, N. Cameron, J. Turner, E. Agbamu, L. Sayles-Adams, K. Wilcox-Harris, T. Battle, N. Faber, L. Cathey, M. Hoerth, C. Mahanay, J. Peterson, S. Theien-Collins, K. Blomberg, T. Parent, P. Barton, T. Stewart-Downey, T. Burr, L. Olson, K. Lombardi, B. McCammon, J. Yang, S. Davenport, H. Koury, J. Lott, R. King, L. Kabala, K. Kohn, E. Metz, M. McCollor, J. Statum-Allen, E. Dooley, S. Dahlke

Other: K. Peterson, K. McCauley, J. Kopp, J. Verges, T. Lonetree

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting was called to order at 4:34 p.m.

**II. AGENDA**

Restructuring School Start Times

- A. Community Partnerships and Steering Committee
  - a. Administration coordinated with several partners in the community, including Metro Transit, staff at Mayor Coleman's office, Saint Paul Parks and Rec., Saint Paul Library, and Sprockets
  - b. The community steering committee met several times in Spring 2016 to bring fresh perspectives to the issue. It included transportation experts, students, parents, principals, teachers and other school staff, and administrators.
  - c. Their work included reviewing sleep research, presentations from experts, discussions of SPPS transportation structure and Metro Transit partnership, review of SPPS community feedback, development of innovative start time change scenarios, review of implications of change scenarios, and determination of a recommendation to the Superintendent.
- B. Committee Recommendation
  - a. The committee used fresh ideas to develop and evaluate dozens of possible change scenarios.
  - b. The leading recommendation is:
    - i. Move all secondary schools to an 8:30am start time**
    - ii. Move elementary schools that currently start at 8:30am to 7:30am**
    - iii. Keep all 9:30am elementary schools at their current start time**
  - c. The cost change implications are neutral if Washington no longer has an extra hour; there will be a cost increase of approximately \$2 million if Washington keeps the extra hour
- C. Rationale
  - a. Aligns with research
  - b. Cost implications are less substantial than earlier proposals

- c. Reduce disruption to students, families, and staff
- D. SPPS Plans for Restructuring School Start Times
  - a. Implement the recommendation starting school year 2019-2020 to align changes with implementation of next strategic plan
  - b. Rationale for this decision included that later start times for secondary students need to happen; we need to align with the research findings, as well as the strategic plan development may include changes to current systems. Changes to start times should happen at the same time to avoid multiple changes for families.
- E. Key challenges and responses for possible solutions were presented regarding childcare, early morning bus times, and athletics.
- F. Additional implications of change considered included impacts to evening hours for homework, employment, and family time, early mornings and sleep recommendations for elementary students, and implications to school choice and competition.
- G. A proposed timeline for next steps include:
  - a. Community feedback at the September 19, 2017 and October 17, 2017 Public Comment sessions
  - b. A Board vote at the October 17, 2017 Board of Education meeting
  - c. Community engagement to support students, schools, staff, and families, as well as planning and preparation with internal and external stakeholders, from October 2017-September 2019.

#### QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:

- What happens to K-8 and 1-8 schools? Answer: They would move according to the structure proposed. A large challenge is that K-8 are some of our biggest schools. The proposed plan includes cost efficiencies which are based on balancing tiers for the number of buses, and by moving them we are able to keep that balance.
- Did the committee analyze the impact of regional and city-wide magnets and look at them differently from community schools? Answer: Yes, that was a proposal presented last year. The price tag was \$2.4 million with those tier changes. The committee did discuss, but it was not a proposal that rose to the top. Families also appreciate the community schools in their school choice process. Therefore, if all schools were placed into one tier, we were eliminating their choice and may be forcing them into magnet programs that were not the right fit for them.
- For the community schools, do they generally have a shorter bus route? If they have a 7:30 start time, they wouldn't necessarily need a 6:30 pick-up because there is a shorter geographic distance? Answer: Yes, with a 7:30 route, it was based on capacity, so there would be a number of buses that would not start at 6:30. Not every elementary school will start with a 6:30 bus pick-up based on this proposed structure.
- How has the conversation with Metro Transit evolved and how it is continuing? Answer: The conversation has continued frequently and consistently. In order to expand the partnership, there would be an additional 15-20 buses; these would be buses that would not run other routes; they would only support schools. Metro Transit also has significant financial challenges; fortunately, the 2017 legislative sessions have been a benefit to them and they are in better shape, but are not in great fiscal shape. However, they are still planning to continue to cut routes and increase fares and do not have the financial means to invest in our expanded partnership. An expansion bill was proposed in the legislature with \$23 million attached, but it was a non-starter and did not work. At this point, they are still experiencing challenging financial times, and it is currently unreasonable for us to expect a partnership expansion, but we will continue trying.
- The concern with Metro Transit is that as they are making decisions on their route structure, our conversations on our routes do not factor in with their conversations. We acknowledge that there are gaps in public transit. We know we have a need as a school district to partner with them and hope that the city and county can work together on the inequities in the transit system. It is not the responsibility of the school district to solve them, but to work together on a solution. There are savings and improvements when all participants work together to improve the transit of our citizens, including the students on the bus. We ask to continue to inform us on the

process because it is a bigger question. Answer: The district will not back off this issue; it has been very successful at Johnson and we hope to be able to serve all students in this way. Another thing to keep in mind is that there are other high schools serviced fine by the current routes, but it is the frequency of runs that are not working. The district tries to provide routes that are 45 minutes or less and no more than one transfer.

- Was a bus transit option considered to lessen the load? Answer: This was considered, but the buses are still running and purchasing Metro Transit passes would equal about the same cost per student as the yellow school bus. Those buses would still go to the same amount of bus stops, but they would pick up less kids. Most stops have a variety of grades.
- What is the phase-in time? Answer: There would be a complete system restructure in 2019-2020.
- Do we have the ability to think of start time choice for elementary schools by area? Answer: That was a proposal in 2015 and was a scenario contemplated by the committee. One of the concerns brought forth was equity and how to decide which schools within an area would get a certain start time. This was actually achieved naturally in the recommended proposal. There are options for 7:30, with magnet and other school options to start at 9:30. This will be achieved by this proposal.
- Could students be hired by the district to provide help in other spots like Discovery Club that may see an increase in participants from the new school start time for elementary students? Answer: With the restructure, the high school students would still be in schools when the elementary schools are dismissed. It can be discussed further. It would need to work with their schedules and the physical ability to travel to those sites.
- With worries about childcare from 2pm on, are we using childcare assistance to help support those families? Are we encouraging families to look into that option? Is there a sense of how many students would qualify? Answer: Families are encouraged to look into these support programs. A lot of students do qualify for this assistance, but there is a cap with childcare resources. Some are prioritized, but not everyone is approved and there is a cap of families that can use this program.
- With changes to Extended Day learning, what does that include? Answer: Currently, it is available two days per week with a certain number of hours. With the restructuring, EDL would be a fill-in for childcare. There are challenges, including student busing and into the same tier structure, and implications to the bus costs. There may also be staffing issues.
- Since a lot of students attend Rec Check and buses are going those location, what will happen since those schools will now be dismissing at 2:00pm and rec centers open at 3? What is the impact on the city and those conversations? Answer: Those are additional conversations that need to happen, including the awareness that rec centers and programs may need to open earlier. There will be challenges since many of college student employees may still be in class. There is time to work through these issues and think of solutions regarding this topic.
- What are conversations that happened with the Mayor's office on scholarships and grants in anticipating community need? Have we been talking with other districts and their effective solutions? Answer: It was not a specific topic that was discussed at the Mayor's office, but it will be. There has been conversation with Minneapolis Schools and their program options. They have 2 days of EDL, and families piece it together after that with similar programs to Discovery Club and FlipSide.
- Could you share more research on data, or anecdotal data, on the sleep research in students, particularly on the social aspects? Answer: While there are few studies on elementary students and start times, there are studies on sleep from infancy. Young children and adults are adaptable to sleep habits. For those adolescents and those in their mid-20s, the mind and melatonin are affected and not as adaptable and they are not able to go to sleep earlier to support the 7:30am start time. Anecdotally, we have heard from others that were afraid of the 7:30 start time, but once the students and families are in a system that works for them, they adapt to the changes. Some elementary students and families say the best time to learn is earlier in the day.
- The concern on bus stops was also noted. Generally, there is a maximum of 1/3 mile that students need to walk in order to get to their bus stop, with most within a block or block and a

- half. There is also a concern that if older students need to walk the elementary siblings to a bus stop, it will defeat the purpose of the later start time for older students. Minnesota has extreme weather, and those considerations need to be discussed as well.
- Is there data or research from other districts if the change in school start times affect enrollment? Answer: It would be something to check into; Wayzata recently changed school start times, and while their size is smaller with less competition from charter schools, it would be a basis point. Research from the Council of the Great City School may be available.
  - What will the impact of start time changes be in area of high poverty? Answer: The conversations will continue around that topic. With the highest population of mobile students, we want to continue to support our families.

#### Positive Behavioral Interventions & Supports (PBIS) and Restorative Practice

- A. Presented at the meeting was a video outlining the highlights of PBIS and Restorative Practice featuring schools, students, and staff.
- B. The framework for PBIS can be viewed as a “shopping cart” that varies by building; a few of the main components include a menu of systems and practices at each tier, a PBIS Team within each building, a school-wide discipline plan, an office discipline referral form, data-driven decision making, and SWIS DataLink
  - a. PBIS Team looks at data to determine what is needed in each school
- C. One of the items in the “PBIS Shopping Cart” is called the Tier Fidelity Inventory (TFI): a tool used to measure how the team is doing at implementing PBIS Framework. The data shows that big gains in schools that are being engaged in PBIS Framework. For Tier 1, the number of schools that took the TFI in 2016-2017 was 54, compared to 18 in 2015-2016. For Tier 2, the number of schools that took the TFI in 2016-2017 was 41, compared to 11 in 2015-2016. For Tier 3, the number of schools that took the TFI in 2016-2017 was 23, compared to 5 in 2015-2016. Tier 1 was the only one required. Schools are engaged in learning the tool; it allows schools to develop an action plan regarding implementation.
- D. Goals for 2017-2018 include increasing the number of schools completing the Tier 2 TFI from 41 to 54 by May 1, 2018, and increase the district average level of Tier 2 implementing from 66% to 75% by May 1, 2018. (PBIS research shows that a score of 70% or higher will show higher student outcomes.)
- E. Positive School Climate and PBIS
  - a. “A place where everyone can thrive.”
  - b. The Department of School Climate and Support organizes all support to schools into the PBIS framework.
  - c. Professional development and implementation of evidence-based strategies to meet the social emotional needs of students and staff.
- F. Restorative practice is essentially about with and in relationships. In a social discipline window, restorative practice finds anchors in high accountability and high support. There are myths that is a “less-than” model; it is actually a radical form of welcome, introduction, and relationships with students, families and educators.
- G. Pilot site work has included partnerships from SPFT and the Office of College and Career Readiness. The group of people working together is diverse, including teachers, social workers, counselors, and community experts, and community circle keepers.
- H. The origin in the indigenous roots of shared people and in our hearts; the true self in everyone is good, wise, and powerful. We need support to encourage and support those healthy relationships. There needs to be equal attention to students who are harmed and those who have harmed.
- I. In 2016-2017, there were 18 school applicants for the program, with 6 pilot sites. One aspect that was acknowledged was the partnership with the University of Minnesota; they have spearheaded our journey with the REA leaders. There are common components between our work in racial equity and restorative practices.
- J. Last spring, there were 13 applicants, and 3 were added to the pilot sites for 2017-2018.
- K. Schools and buildings are also implementing their own version of restorative practice, with 3 receiving direct financial support from a grant.

- L. Restorative Practice Year 1 Growth includes:
  - a. Students spent an average of 42 hours in community-building circles
  - b. Educators responded to an average of 1,500 minor incidents of misbehavior with restorative chats or affective RP statements
  - c. Site leads and RP facilitators responded to at least 1,156 incidents of harm using restorative practices.
- M. Restorative practice hopes and dreams include:
  - a. Continue funding pilot sites and capacity building model
  - b. Continue to collaborate and learn with allies and community partners using multiple perspectives
  - c. Expanding our community and school collaboration to create additional spaces where we all can thrive.

#### QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:

- What does sustainability look like for this program? Answer: In pilot sites, educators experienced 800 hours of PD; district-wide, there has been 3300 hours of professional development. At least one person in every building has experienced some sort of restorative practice training. Anchors have grounding in restorative values and community circles so there are spaces to return to. With the different ebb and flows of students and teachers in buildings, three years is a minimum point at which MDE wants to hold a school in that journey place, with 3-5 years in a larger scope. Sustainability means a radical welcome to any teacher and any student, each with their dynamic stories. Sustainability is also connected to the strategic planning process to listen, learn, and lead. Three years is the minimum amount of time needed to see the trends, and after that third year, we should have a good idea on the next steps. There is also an ongoing piece of those schools on the waiting list that have not been selected yet and the conversations on the plan for those schools.
- Why are restorative practices and school climate work separate from academic work? Social emotional well-being is integral to achievement, and wondering what work is being done to use that as a base for instruction and how to work together to build into the overall culture. Answer: Restorative practices are used for building relationships with administration, staff, teachers, students, and families. It starts with community building circles and to build community in classrooms. Some teachers take it to the next step with teaching in circles for academics. With the tougher situations, it's also about having conversations with students and staff. The beauty is understanding of building a strong foundation in community circles. Each person brings a set of gifts and perspectives into that shared space. It allows students to speak with their heart. It gives students and teachers a voice and power to speak their truth.
- It was noted to show the results of the process. When we hear concerns about climate in buildings, the community is less focused about the process, but more concerned about the difference it makes. It's important to talk about how to raise up the process and the results and experiences to show the results in each building. With PBIS, show the difference in each building and what PBIS is doing. Show the climate one can expect. Explain to community members what it looks like and daily experiences with these programs. Push to be more concrete on the process outcomes.
- How are we communicating restorative practices and PBIS to families in buildings? We acknowledge that the origins of restorative practice in SPPS are rooted in the harm that did occur. Eighteen schools shared their stories on their applications. The Office of College and Career Readiness recently met with the Communications Department to review the next steps for a strategic communications plan, how those stories unite and are uniquely separate, as well as how it is communicated to the community about how it looks, sounds, and feels. It was also recommended to add how it relates to academic achievement.
- Do we have data around the academics of the program? Answer: Year 1 did not involve measuring grades. Years 2 and 3 will expand on measuring more school climate activities. We are using the Minnesota Student survey, which happens every three years to capture some of this data. There is anecdotal data from teachers about academics and using restorative practices. To expand on that, restorative practices is also about culture. Part of the culture that has not been established is the academic culture that we wish to have. There are questions to answer, and we can build support systems around those questions, including the prioritization of what those will be.

- Could you tell us about how it works in the reality of the school? When a parent walks in, what do they see? What goes into ensuring that teachers can teach and students can learn? If something happens, what is the real restorative process? Answer: From a school perspective and the repair of harm, the student needs to have a relationship and care about the classroom. School wide pro-social community circles have been regularly implemented at some schools. The student and teacher need to care, and they need to have a desire to repair the situation. If a student needs to step out, they meet with their grade's behavioral specialist to train and discuss on how they can repair the situation with the teacher, or other student. There is a larger repair process that needs to happen. Every time a child does something in a school community, there is a restorative reflection. There is work with the student and the teacher in order for the student to re-enter that community while reflecting on what happened, what they did wrong, and how it affected them, the community, and others.
- Do we understand that teachers have flexibility for behaviors in their classroom? Answer: In the community building circles, it sets up an opportunity to share voices and everyone hears that voice. Teachers are a part of this. Each classroom may have its own style, yet there are community expectations that everyone shares. There is a common community language, and when those expectations are harmed, then restorative repair occurs. It has grounds in being responsible, respectable and safe.

### Proposed Pay18 Levy

- As a note, all figures included in the report are based on the Administration's best estimates using the statutory authorized amounts. MDE provided preliminary Pay18 levy calculations on September 8<sup>th</sup>, and continue to make adjustments to SPPS number through September.
  - Most districts certify their maximum levy because it can be lowered, but cannot be increased once it is set. The levy can only move down after October 1.
- The school levy authority is established by law. School budgets are a combination of state, federal and local funding, including the voter approved referendum.
- The Pay18 school levy funds the 2018-2019 school year. It contributes approximately 20% of the SPPS budget. The estimated maximum levy ceiling for the Pay18 levy is 6.95%.
- Property tax is determined by state legislature, taxing jurisdictions, and the county assessor. The major factors impacting property taxes were reviewed.
- Factors impacting the Saint Paul Levy are:
  - Overall estimated market values are up 9.8% from prior year and may reach 2008 levels
  - Double digit increases for a number of commercial, industrial, and apartment properties
  - Residential areas are more moderate
  - School portion of fiscal disparities aid increasing
  - Changes to Saint Paul right of way/street maintenance programs
- Factors impacting school levies include:
  - Changes in pupil counts
  - Legislative changes to education formulas
  - Referendum inflationary increase
  - Pension contribution changes required by law
  - OPEB obligations
  - Employment changes that drive severance and unemployment levies
  - Capital bonding, refunding of bonds, abatements, long term maintenance, health and safety projects, and lease costs
- The proposed estimated Pay18 Levy Ceiling was presented with Pay17 compared to the estimated Pay18 levy ceiling.
- The estimated annual property tax impact for homes from 2017 to 2018 (assuming a 0% increase in market value) was presented with estimated change at 4.0% ceiling, 5.0% ceiling, 6.0% ceiling, and the estimated change at the estimated max levy of 6.95%.

- I. The estimated annual property tax impact for homes from 2017 to 2018 (assuming a 7.7% increase in market value) was presented with estimated change at 4.0% ceiling, 5.0% ceiling, 6.0% ceiling, and the estimated change at the estimated max levy of 6.95%.
- J. The estimated annual property tax impact for commercial/industrial from 2017 to 2018 (assuming a 17%% increase in market value) was presented with estimated change at 4.0% ceiling, 5.0% ceiling, 6.0% ceiling, and the estimated change at the estimated max levy of 6.95%.
- K. A Pay18 Levy calendar was presented with the Board of Education to set the ceiling for the Pay18 levy at the September 19, 2017 Board of Education Meeting, and certifying it at the December 19, 2017 Board Meeting.

**A requested action for the Board to certify the maximum Pay18 levy ceiling at the September 19, 2017 meeting was proposed and passed.**

2016-2017 Indian Education Parent Committee Response Letter

- A. A letter from the Indian Education Parent Committee was read, which officially acknowledged and accepted the Administration Response to the 2016-2017 Parent Committee Resolution of Non-Concurrence. Although the Parent Committee is not completely satisfied with the Administrative response and feel there is more the district could do to ensure the success of American Indian students, they do acknowledge the positive working relationship with the district and look forward to continuing the collaboration for the new academic school year.

Work Session

- A. A work session highlighting details of the Facilities Maintenance Plan and a report on solar energy were presented following the adjournment of the Committee of the Board meeting.

**III. ADJOURNMENT II**

Mr. Schumacher moved, seconded by Mr. Marchese to adjourn the meeting. The motion passed by acclaim.

The meeting adjourned at 7:12 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sarah Dahlke  
Assistant Clerk