

**MEETING MINUTES
COMMITTEE OF THE BOARD MEETING
July 11, 2017**

PRESENT: Board of Education: J. Schumacher, S. Marchese (arrived at 4:44), Z. Ellis, J. Brodrick, M. Vanderwert, J. Foster, C. Vue (arrived at 4:34 p.m.)

Staff: Superintendent Gothard, A. Collins, C. Baker, M. Gilbert, L. Erickson, M. Hoerth, D. Abrams, J. Williams, H. Kilgore, M. Schrul, N. Cameron, J. Turner, J. Engen, E. Agbamu, L. Sayles-Adams, K. Wilcox-Harris, T. Battle, L. Cathey, G. Ghere, C. Mahanay, J. Peterson, T. Parent, S. Dahlke

Other: K. Sterns, M. Wall, K. McCauley, C. Flowers, J. Kopp, T. Dreher, J. Nathan, J. Farnsworth, J. Vargas

I. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 4:30 p.m.

II. AGENDA

A. Facilities Master Plan (FMP)

A. Facilities Master Plan Successes for FY2017

- a. The five-year plan for FY2017 was presented with major capital improvements to ten schools across the district.
- b. Current projects will improve the learning environments of 8,750 students in areas such as learning spaces and cafeterias.
- c. The SEAB feedback included informal spaces for learning and gathering reflected in 8 current projects.

B. FMP Governance Committee

- a. Two sessions were used to inform the five-year implementation plan (FY18-FY22) with input on emerging factors impacting the five-year plan, including options for addressing middle school capacity. Co-creators of engagement framework for broader middle school engagement and BOE consideration helped to develop the plan with comprehensive raw session notes provides to inform related conversations.
- b. Process outcomes include that it is not impetus to change criteria for prioritization. Challenging questions were identified, including how to stay committed to making substantive changes under current enrollment projections, how to ensure buildings are being efficiently used during a time of declining enrollment, the need to improve equity metrics beyond geographic, and what is the impact of leadership changes to facilities use?
- c. Process outcomes for middle school growth: Middle school use has a prudent course of action to delay construction of a new middle school in Area A. Instead other projects will be prioritized. We need to engage Area A around middle school needs. There are options for middle school capacity options. One is to build a new middle school in Area A. Two is to acquire Crosswinds School in Woodbury that the state is in the process of selling. Three is to use existing schools to increase middle school capacity, via expansions and programmatic changes. The majority of students in Area A are attending Parkway Middle.
- d. Process outcomes for PreK growth: The 2017 legislature provides voluntary PreK funding, and we are working with the Early Learning Office to provide all-day

kindergarten funding for SY18-19. The planning for creation of Early Learning Hub(s) are expected to be complete as early as Fall 2018. These would be a one-stop shop for early learning family needs starting at birth to kindergarten. Mixed service delivery systems (Head Start, Fraser, early childhood screening, Discovery Club, etc) will help to leverage partnerships we have with others. The focus of this will be in under-used buildings in high-demand areas. A bend in the curve of enrollment is possible as families enter SPPS earlier. The waitlist for SY2016-17 is 400 students, which is the majority for full day. From FMP start, SPPS will have added 29% more PreK classrooms. Even if all of FMP was implemented, SPPS would still only have space for 50% of 4 year olds in the city, assuming they are all all-day students.

C. Key Directions

- a. The five-year plan of proposed project highlights includes the continuation of FY2017 projects, Jie Ming moves to Homecroft, major modernizations in schools across the city, aligning square footage with building enrollment and program needs (not necessarily increasing capacity). Permanent construction is underway. The number of portable classrooms will substantially decrease with the five-year plan from 15 in 2016 to 1 in 2023. For growth and alignment, we are realizing the challenges for underused facilities. The focus will be on improving learning spaces and building core rooms, such as gyms, cafeterias, kitchens, etc. We want to create quality learning spaces where we can collaborate with educators, students, and families to design learning spaces that meet FMP vision, principles, and standards. Additional highlights include \$11,700,000 for ten schools to upgrade their athletic facilities. There will be 100% instructional AV updates in technology by 2021. Playgrounds of 13 schools will be renewed.

D. Board of Education Investment Resolution of December 2015

- a. Sound stewardship to invest in buildings at industry standard level of 2.8% of replacement value of existing portfolio. Currently at 2.4%. We are short term stewards for long term assets.

E. Five-year Plan for Building Conditions

- a. Existing system preservation data sets include the 2009 Facilities Condition Assessment, 2015 FCA Update, Energy Use Intensity Data, 2015 Indoor Air Quality Sampling, and other misc. reports and analyses.

- F. The five-year plan of proposed facilities investment is about \$587 million, which includes new construction, major repair/replacement, abatement, and renovation. We will dive into numbers and financials more at the next meeting.

Action at the July 11, 2017 Board of Education meeting to include an approval of the long term facilities maintenance 10-year plan documentation for submission to the Minnesota Department of Education

Action at the August 15, 2017 Board of Education meeting to include a vote on the FY2018-2022 five-year facilities maintenance and capital plan resolution

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:

1. Of all the kids in SPPS that are PreK age, what is the optimal percentage of those families that would be sending their kids to SPPS? Answer: 100% of families should have access to PreK in SPPS. We are hearing loud and clear that the waitlist for PreK is long, and our goal is realistic. Families do have other options, including HeadStart and child care centers as well. It's really up to the families to decide what is best for their child, but we want to give them access to it.
2. How do we factor in programming changes that might occur that could create different priorities with different sites? Answer: The FMP is a roadmap of our vision. It may not be advanced in what services we can provide for special education or MLL, but that's something in which we have a lot of flexibility in design process of the building. Many of these programs will not be impacted.
3. It is fair to say that keeping maintained will keep the value up. Some improvements may or may not increase that value. We're in a position of trying to maintain to give more options. For

sequencing of projects, some adjustments have been made. We need to develop a mechanism to trigger a revision – take a broader lens to where we were two years ago. There are ways to incorporate additional questions.

4. Where are we in terms of being on track for what we had original envisioned? Answer: A deep dive into the numbers will be presented at a future meeting. We always go back to the commitments made to the Board, the financial stewards. (\$484 was last year before RiverEast was layered into the plan)
5. The Board also requested to remember to look at the balance between building new and maintaining what we currently have and how that will fit into the FMP. We have not talked enough our reconciling our FMP with how well we are doing in maintaining. Our front door could look great, but if the facilities on the inside or the football field are in need of repair, we need to address that. How are we going to work on that? If we build something new, how are we going to maintain it? We need to talk about where funding comes from and how we can do it. Answer: The value and importance of maintaining facilities is very important – every dollar spent in maintaining will save \$6 in overall lifestyle cost savings. Those two activities are separate – the general fund pays for the maintenance, while bonds and levies pay for the FMP and those two entities cannot be crossed unfortunately. We will maximize opportunities with the funding source.
6. What can we do as a Board to try to overcome the fact that we need money to build facilities but are thinking we might not have money to maintain them? How do we address that to not let SPPS down and the city of St. Paul? We need to solve that issue. Answer: Stress that admin works hard to leverage every opportunity. LTFM is a great program to leverage the expansion of the program as aggressively as we can. Trust that we are trying to maximize every opportunity. Leverage other agencies and partnerships. We have things to offer others, just as others have to offer us. It is a significant challenge and something the Facilities department is well aware of.

III. ADJOURNMENT I FOR BOARD OF EDUCATION MEETING

Ms. Ellis called for a recess for the Board of Education at 5:23pm. Remaining agenda items for the Committee of the Board to immediately follow.

IV. RECONVENING OF THE COMMITTEE TO THE BOARD MEETING

The meeting reconvened at 8:23pm to continue with the remaining agenda items.

A. Winning Students for SPPS

A. SPPS Enrollment Growth Project

- a. The goal of the project is to develop understanding and adopt strategies to retain and increase the number of families who choose to enroll in SPPS
- b. The current situation includes low student retention, insufficient student recruitment, and declining enrollment in both total numbers and share of the market with no changes in funding
- c. To enhance stability and quality in SPPS schools, the district must look for new ways to offset budget cuts while increasing revenue. The most effective way is by retaining and attracting students.
- d. Action to include contracting with Winning Students, LLC to create a robust, ambitious, and attainable growth plan and process to increase SPPS enrollment in 3 years. Currently in Phase I: Discovery.

B. Research/Findings

- a. Parent satisfaction focus in the key to success
- b. SPPS is part of an educational marketplace, where parents are the “buyers”
- c. Marketing and market research is essential to creating a district that is responsive to its users and will help to bridge a gap between what people want and what is offered.
- d. Market research leads to reliable product development (school programming options) and strategies to inform.
- e. By listening to what current and potential parents desire, the district will create stronger schools with better outcomes and more satisfied families.

- f. If SPPS market share remained at 72%, that would equal \$50 million per year more.
 - g. SPPS students are extremely diverse. They are more highly educated than the majority of highly-populated areas in the US. There is a large immigrant population, and 72% of those parents expect their children to go to college.
 - h. Growth will come from the 38% of the market of those who are not attending SPPS.
 - i. There are many schools within the city of St. Paul that are competition to SPPS, including charters, private school, and surrounding districts.
 - j. Key findings of universal desires of parents include: wanting their child to reach their individual potential and a safe and orderly learning environment. These are baseline standards for parents. After basics are met, parents choose on school characteristics. They decide on the best fit by making trade-offs. Priorities change over time for each child.
 - k. Understanding how parents cluster along similar preferences help to create market segments, and understanding those segments would help SPPS to communicate/market more effectively.
- C. SPPS Potential Competitive Advantages
- a. Advantages of SPPS include our size and ability to differentiate product offerings, quality teachers, a committed and supportive community, our location in an urban, centralized capital city, talented and diverse students, rich in the arts, wilderness/environmental spaces in our city, higher education opportunities, and our history and culture of educational innovations.
- D. Recommended Implementation Plan
- a. 3rd Qtr – 2017: Plans for this time include: ready a launch process of a few key pieces of school-level parent satisfaction data; a clear and comprehensive framework for defining and ensuring SPPS’ “product quality”; evaluation of each school’s Facebook presence; design and promote “SPPS Successes” in an online form; Hmong-specific marketing plans to compete with Hmong charter schools; evaluation of this spring’s enrollment campaign and make recommendations; and an evaluation of SPPS.org.
 - b. 4th Qtr – 2017: Plans for this time include: create an integrated marketing function; creating, set goals, and launch a greatschools.org campaign; identify 2-3 key metrics and define those metric goals for Spring 2018 Enrollment campaign; address middle school retention; evaluation of the district’s current digital marketing campaign; recruit volunteer SPPS ambassadors; conduct a board-led review of the current methodology for determining target enrollment for individual schools; create a strong, districtwide arts and music programming; and promote admissions events and tours while requesting online pre-registration.
 - c. 1st Qtr – 2018: Plans for this time include: adopt a new version of district policies; conduct a first parent satisfaction/feedback survey and distribute data; charge a new Director of Marketing/CMO with the task of evaluating the goals and operations of the Student Placement Center and make recommendations to strengthen; charge superintendent and Director of Marketing/CMO with creating an initial framework or list of key performance indicators (KPIs) for evaluating each school as a “product”; and evaluate SPPS.org’s utility as a marketing channel and customer service platform
 - d. 2nd Qtr – 2018: Plans for this time include: evaluation of CMO recommendations and adopt a framework for evaluating individual schools; design and secure funding for a Hmong community and enrollment trends and a St. Paul Educational Market Segment Study to inform creation of a balanced “product portfolio” of schools; and strengthen personal ties with new enrollees to improve show rate
 - e. 3rd Qtr – 2018: Plans for this time include: complete and post-campaign analyses of Spring 2018 enrollment, Hmong “high-leakage” elementary schools, and greatschools.org campaign; report on Director of Marketing/CMO’s recommendations for the placement services; and publicize individual school “product” evaluations
 - f. Non-timeline specific recommendations include: ensure clear, desirable pathways are planned for all SPPS students over the next 2 years; investigate and start plans for expanded post-secondary partnerships, online k-12 (600 students in St. Paul participating in online programs not through us; state pays \$8000/pupil), and expanded

PreK while determining feasibility and ROI; explore more flexible alternatives to hard class-size caps; and address school climate, finance, and instructional needs of the district.

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:

1. What is the number of students that enroll in our schools from other districts? Answer: The number of students enrolling in our schools from outside the district has been pretty flat over the years at about 1500.
2. How many of those children that are non-enrolled in SPPS are special needs? Answer: Anecdotally, people report there are not a lot of services for special needs kids in those private and charter schools or not as much as a public school would have. SPPS takes care of the needs of all special education students, regardless of where they are enrolled.
3. It would be helpful to identify particular examples of where these practices have been put into place outside of Minnesota to give us a guidepost of how it's operated. We're not unique in these challenges. It would be helpful to see models of other strategies and being able to point to how other districts have changed their enrollment. Answer: There isn't a lot out there, since a lot of it is new information. A lot of people are where we are right now. Washington D.C. was able to increase their enrollment by 2% with some of these same strategies. Dallas is doing more of an integration attempt, and it will impact enrollment. Everything is really new and in a pilot stage.
4. Did you look at those charter schools that have PreK already offered and did that impact their enrollment? Answer: That wasn't researched specifically, but we could use our current data to see which schools have PreK and how does that compare to the schools where we don't have PreK. One interesting point is that PreK is not mandated by state, but we have a great PreK program and retain about 80% of those. The charter school market isn't quite there yet because of the costs.
5. This is not simply a plan – it needs to become part of our culture. It will take time, and needs to become part of our routine and how we do things and operate. There needs to be some synthesizing as a team to put some specific action plans together for short term and long term changes for movement. Many are time sensitive for recommendations.
6. It was also mentioned that there is a separate task force looking at integration and looking at our district and thinking of own series of recommendations (in partnership with SPFT) that may be from a different angle. That is another component to this conversation – how we look at our schools, how they operate given enrollment, how we can increase opportunities and partner together.
7. What kind of research led you to recommendations? Answer: Initial phase was research review without new information. Studies like the Wilder Foundation from 2010 were important with representative sampling. The other piece was analyzing superintendent search data for trends and patterns because it was an opportunity for parents to talk about what is important to them. A study done in Region F last year was conducted and that data was used. And finally, there was limited data from exit interview; it's not reputable as a stand-alone piece due to insufficient population (120 responses and 1200 people who left), but it aligned with all the other trends. National and other school district studies were also used and noted in the research. It's important to become more data driven and understand our users.

J. Work Session

1. **School Resource Officer (SRO)**

Laurie Olson, Director of Security and Emergency Management, presented an overview and update on the school year and be able to go into current negotiations with the St. Paul Police Department with a roadmap of how we got here. The heart of the SRO conversation is a student centered approach. There were 5 SRO arrests last year. Arrests do not mean the situation was done – Ramsey County has multiple stopgaps and assessments to divert the student. A question was raised about the 19 incidents involving handcuffs, but only 5 arrests and the response was that handcuffs were used if the safety of the student was at risk, handcuffs were used until the student was deemed safe; then the discipline approach would return to the school side. A question was also raised about the pepper spray incidents, and

the response was that in these situations, verbal warnings and directives were not followed. The majority of incidents were for crowd dissipation where staff and SROs could not get to the middle of the situation to help. In first week introductions and orientations, students are instructed on a plan if an emergency situation does happen and to keep a safe space for people to respond to the issue. A question was also raised if there were any numbers of incidents by school, and the answer was that there was no glaring hotspot.

We want students to have a positive relationship with SROs, because there is a law enforcement career that could happen because of it. There is a district-wide advisory panel including parents and families. Students have been invited, but schedules have not always worked with the meeting times, but rotating students were able to voice their opinions at the meeting on a rotating basis. The advisory panel has helped to develop a flow chart of SRO involvement that has been beneficial. It's rare for flow chart to lead to arrest of student because there are many avenues to divert the student back to the school. The old vision was a straight violation. But now, more employees are engaging with students and know what is happening at home or in their life, and how we can better support them. Building level meetings with SROs have been beneficial where students are able to stop by to "chat and chew" with officers.

Accountability for the SROs is important because it's a large investment, as stewards of finances for the district. The most important times for an SRO to be present is 7am-3pm to help with transition times (bus arrivals, dismissals, etc). We have a reduction of 9 SROs to 7 because we are losing the mobile officers. The goal is to limit street squad officers responding to schools.

A question was raised about the salary for the SRO when it appears they are paid for an entire year, but working part of the year, and what are they doing during those other months that school is not in session? The answer was that SROs do work during summer school. On non-school days, they are still working with us or in training with regular police department duties. Community support liaisons (CSL) are a critical part of keeping our schools safe. A question was raised if they are part of a pilot program without SROs. The answer was that there's nothing that's not on the table for ideas and there was a short test during a transition, but one negative with that plan is that if something bad does happen, street squad police are called instead of an SRO with whom students are familiar. There needs to be a special mix of CSLs and SROs to make our schools the safest possible. CSLs have a great interaction with students, and there's a great engagement with them to change the school climate and dynamic. It was noted that it would be interesting to hear what CSLs think about that potential conversation.

Impacts on reduction was also discussed. A "buddy school" system could be in place, where schools share an SRO. (If there was something happening at Ramsey, a Central SRO could respond instead of a street squad. Then, when students attend Central after Ramsey, they will see that same SRO.) We want kids to see them in a positive way. Increasing CSLs could also be a great benefit to the program. A negative impact of the reduction could be an increase in street squad officers to respond more frequently to elementary schools due to child welfare calls.

It was noted that we should encourage alternate ways of addressing issues without the involvement of police and the appreciation for task force best practices on a national level. It's both answering questions of vision of climate, and involving students and staff in those discussions as well. Also, we need to look at a transition plan and what it will look like in 1, 3, or 5 years and wrap this into the discussion because the cost is substantial. If the city increases the fringe, we still pay for that.

A question was raised about how many students want police officers in the building and the answer was 92% (MN School Survey of students). The lowest percentage of race (Native Americans) that wanted police in the schools was 69%.

Another question was raised on the input from SEAB, and the answer was that they did a great job on ideas for work to be done and highlighting areas to improve upon for contract last year. A question was also raised about the training of CSLs, and the answer was that they are trained with the SPPS Security and Emergency Management department in the same guides given to SROs but they have no training in physical guard training. They are not SPPD employees;

they are community members who can understand the behind the scenes with our students. They are paid \$20/hour. They could also benefit from the reflective practice as well.

If anyone has questions on this given the next steps for next month's vote to please send those questions or concerns because it may make sense to convene again or disperse information before the next Board of Education meeting. A vote on the contract will happen at the August 15, 2017 Board of Education meeting.

III. ADJOURNMENT II

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

The meeting adjourned at 10:39 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sarah Dahlke
Assistant Clerk